

Heaven. There is something special about the outlook of children toward the eternal things of life. Sometimes I feel that children are the only ones who see most clearly the most important things of life. Next to them are perhaps their mothers. We fathers are sometimes very slow to find lasting solutions to the problems which beset mankind.

I want to congratulate young Peter Rodino on his thought that young people in America might help to bring the world together in more peaceful pursuits and in more lasting security and freedom. I wish him every success in this and I have a feeling that perhaps his efforts may be much more important than he can possibly imagine.

I am reminded of the passage of the Peace Corps legislation when so many people seemed to sneer at it and even

condemn it as being un-American, while in fact, it has been a very substantial aid to America and a very substantial aid to the security and peace of our world.

Good luck, Peter.

To Amend the Peace Corps Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I regret that due to circumstances beyond my control, I was unable to be

present on April 3, during the debate, to register my strong support for the continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps.

The overwhelming vote by the Members of this body for the Peace Corps is testimony to the growing body of its friends in the House. We are pleased to join the continuing chorus of approval from abroad by the people of those countries who have received these voluntary ambassadors of good will. The record of this program in its first year has been excellent. Its aims, its operations, its administration, its personnel, all reaffirm the wisdom of its establishment. It reminds us that new approaches to international understanding and cooperation can be fruitful and serve jointly the best interests of the United States and peoples abroad.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best, amidst the clamor of busy cares, we seek a quiet cloister of the soul where spirit with spirit may meet.

We seek that elixir of living water which alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits, saving us from physical exhaustion, from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine, from cynicism and bitterness of heart.

Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals in this Chamber of deliberation, may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days, yet days big with challenge, be higher than our own.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS, AS AMENDED—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was re-

ferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:
I am transmitting herewith the 15th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 9, 1962.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3508. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H.R. 4441. An act to authorize the appropriation of \$3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations;

H.R. 6682. An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; and

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3508. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H.R. 6682. An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; and

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4441. An act to authorize the appropriation of \$3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

JOINT SESSION ON APRIL 12 TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE SHAH OF IRAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, on Thursday, April 12, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses, at which time the Senate will join the House of Representatives, in its Hall, for the purpose of hearing an address by the Shah of Iran.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication

and letters, which were referred as indicated:

RIGHTS OF SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor and Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the government of the Virgin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ACTIVITIES, 1937-62

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on Interstate Commerce Commission activities, 1937-62 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF LAW RELATING TO FREE IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of the law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution relating to price supports for milk

"Whereas milk is recognized as one of the most basic food commodities and is necessary for the health and well-being of all citizens; and

"Whereas it has long been recognized that because of the many problems involved both in production and marketing of milk that it is necessary for the Government to guarantee through price supports a fair and equitable return to the producer of milk; and

"Whereas without such price supports the producers of milk would be forced into other activities, with the result that the public would be deprived of a proper supply of this basic food; and

"Whereas under the provisions of law providing for price support for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities (sec. 1446, title 7, U.S.C.), unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a given parity price is necessary in order to assure an adequate supply of these products, the statutorily guaranteed price will not be effective after March 31, 1962; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture in making such determination should carefully consider not only the immediate supply available but the supply which can reasonably be expected in the future; and

"Whereas if such support price is lowered, such lowering will drive from the market innumerable producers, which would endanger the continuation of an adequate supply; and

"Whereas a determination of the adequacy of the supply of any commodity, and particularly milk, must, in a nation as large and diversified as the United States, be based not only on the immediate situation but also on the overall long-range situation if the public is to be assured of the continuous supply required for its health and well-being: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take all action possible to safeguard the future supply of milk by continuing the present level of price supports, and particularly that the Secretary of Agriculture give proper consideration to the fact that any lowering of such price support level will require many producers to cease such production; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, to the President and Vice President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to the chairman of the House Standing Committee on Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution relating to reduction of pensions of veterans in State veterans' homes

"Whereas House Resolution 869, introduced by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, would amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to a pension, who are being maintained in State veterans' homes, shall receive reduced pensions at the rate of \$30 per month; and

"Whereas enactment of this legislation would not only reduce pensions to such veterans, but would also seriously affect the operation of State veterans' homes which now, or in the future, may charge veterans for care: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the adoption of this legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution relative to the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant

"Whereas the northerly shore of Contra Costa County, upon which the city of Antioch and its extensive industrial developments are situated, has historically enjoyed an available supply of fresh water throughout most of the year; and

"Whereas that supply has steadily deteriorated, due to salt water intrusion, caused by upstream water diversions and storage on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries, with the attendant threat to growth of municipal communities and industrial developments in Contra Costa County; and

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has taken the position that salinity control is not a proper function of the Central Valley project, and has only tacitly agreed that releases from Shasta Dam, the only present means of controlling salinity encroachment, will not be diminished until Contra Costa County finds another solution to its problem; and

"Whereas economical conversion of saline to fresh water could solve this county's problem by supplying an adequate amount of water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses as replacement for water lost through upstream diversions; and

"Whereas the Antioch site is an ideal one for a conversion plant since the seasonal variations in salinity of offshore water and the many varied uses in and near Antioch for fresh water, will provide ideal conditions for making economic analysis of the conversion process: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Department of the Interior, to take such action as may be necessary for the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution relative to Federal aid for State veterans' homes and hospitals

"Whereas there are 33 State veterans' homes and hospitals in the United States; and

"Whereas existing facilities for hospital, intermediate, and nursing home care are wholly inadequate to care for the ever-increasing number of older veterans suffering from serious chronic disabilities requiring medical and nursing care; and

"Whereas new construction, modernization, additions and improvements at State veterans homes are urgently needed to replace old and obsolete structures and to provide new facilities; and

"Whereas House Resolution No. 270, introduced by Congressman B. F. SISK, of California, and House Resolution No. 3182, introduced by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, at the request of the National Association of State Veterans Homes, have been introduced in the current session of Congress to assist States, through Federal aid subsidies, to finance, in part, capital outlay expense; and

"Whereas financial assistance from the Federal Government to provide such facilities for the older veteran is urgently required in California due to the tremendous number of war veterans residing in the State; and

"Whereas this State, alone, cannot finance the cost of providing hospital and nursing home facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to appropriate money to provide States with Federal aid subsidies to finance, in part, the construction, modernization, additions and improvements of State-operated veterans homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relating to Federal subsidy for portion of operating costs of State nursing homes for veterans

"Whereas House Resolution 9565, introduced by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, by request, would amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of a portion of the cost to the States, operating State veterans homes, of furnishing nursing home care to veterans of any war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate money to provide States with Federal aid subsidies for the payment of a portion of the cost of furnishing nursing home care to veterans in State-operated veterans homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution relative to deductions from Federal payments to State veterans' homes

"Whereas House Resolution 9737 has been introduced at this session of Congress by Congressman CLEM MILLER, of California; and

"Whereas this legislation has been introduced to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State veterans' home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and which are used for recreational and other purposes not required by State laws; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration, by administrative order, effective April 1, 1961, now requires the States to report said collections, and a like amount is deducted

from Federal aid payments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation as proposed in House Resolution 9737, which provides: 'No reduction shall be made under this subsection by reason of the retention or collection by a State home of any amounts from the estate of a deceased veteran if such amounts are placed in a post fund or other special fund and used for the benefit of the State home or its inhabitants in providing—

“(A) Educational, recreational, or entertainment facilities or activities;

“(B) Operation of post exchanges; or

“(C) Other activities or facilities for the benefit of the home or its inhabitants, which are not specifically required by State law, including the cost of any necessary insurance to protect the property of such fund or any of its facilities”; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 21

"Resolution relative to Federal aid for State Highway Route 115

"Whereas State Highway Route 115, from San Jose, in Santa Clara County, to Patterson, in Stanislaus County, via the vicinity of Mount Hamilton, is the only east-west connection between the San Joaquin Valley and the seacoast between the Altamont and Pacheco Pass, a distance of over 50 miles; and

"Whereas this route, although a part of the State highway system, has not been accepted for maintenance by the California Department of Public Works, and is presently maintained by both Santa Clara and Stanislaus Counties; and

"Whereas this route would be of inestimable value as an avenue of escape should there be a need for dispersal of the citizens concentrated on the heavily populated peninsula below San Francisco in the case of an atomic attack or other disaster; and

"Whereas the highway is now designated as the only escape route directly eastward from San Jose in the civil defense operations plan of the State of California; and

"Whereas in addition to its national defense benefits, if improved, the highway could be of great economic and recreational benefit to the coast counties and the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley, in particular, and to the Nation generally; and

"Whereas because of the heavy commitments of the State of California in its construction and maintenance of highways, money is not available to substantially improve or reroute this highway in order to provide an adequate connection between the coast counties and the San Joaquin Valley for the smooth flow of traffic in case of enemy attack or natural disaster; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully memorialized to provide Federal funds for the highway between San Jose and Patterson; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Rep-

resentatives, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

"Attest:

"J. A. BECK,
Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 60

"Resolution relating to the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, with letter dated January 15, 1962, forwarded to the Congress of the United States reports recommending the early authorization of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project and related units; and

"Whereas the facilities to be constructed are vitally needed to supply water to areas within Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, and San Joaquin Counties; and

"Whereas the supplemental water which will be made available by the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project is urgently needed, in part, to preserve the use of large acreages of highly productive farmland which is now endangered by a rapidly falling water table and a lack of adequate surface water supplies; and

"Whereas the proposed facilities are necessary for the full development of the American River as a working unit of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas these facilities will provide much needed additional flood control protection for the city of Sacramento, along the lower regions of the American River, along the Sacramento River, and within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

"Whereas the entire State of California will benefit from the proposed project by additional flood protection for the capital city of the State and by the provision of an adequate supply of water for an important agricultural and urban area of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California commends the Secretary of the Interior for recognizing the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California urges appropriate action, particularly by the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, directed toward the early authorization and construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted by the clerk of the assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 11

"Resolution relative to enactment of House of Representatives bill 10144 providing for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act

"Whereas a bill, H.R. 10144, providing for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act was introduced on February 7, 1962, in the House of Representatives of the United States; and

"Whereas this bill would make it unlawful for employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations, engaged in commerce, to discriminate on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry, or age, except insofar as religion or age may reasonably relate to the qualifications for employment; and

"Whereas this bill would further provide for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to promote the purposes of this act; and

"Whereas such discrimination is contrary to American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest; and

"Whereas such discrimination also deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions adopted by the city councils of the cities of Healdsburg, Maywood, and Vernon, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal tax on the income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3128. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virginia Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 5, 1962.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably with an amendment, on April 6, 1962, the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act, and submitted a report (No. 1325) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO MARKETING QUOTAS ON IRISH POTATOES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of March 22 and April 2, 1962, the names of Senators MANSFIELD, ENGLE, JORDAN, ERVIN, CARROLL, and SMITH of Massachusetts were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3050) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through

establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE on March 22, 1962.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT, RELATING TO RAILROAD MERGERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1962, the names of Senators GRUENING, MCCARTHY, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, BARTLETT, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3097) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1963, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) on April 3, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 16, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Text of recent radio broadcast by himself over Wisconsin radio stations, on the subject of the need for youth development and antidelinquency programs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

First annual Jefferson-Jackson Day speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, at Huntington, W. Va., sponsored by the Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County, made on Saturday, April 7, 1962.

GERMANY AND BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a reprint of an editorial from the Hearst newspapers which was written by Mr. William R. Hearst, Jr., the editor in chief. It is entitled, "New Look at Germany," and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial is written with a refreshing perspective and detachment, and advances some very interesting and useful new thoughts on Germany and the problems of peace in that region. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President,

that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and that two speeches of mine on the subject of Germany and Berlin be printed in the RECORD immediately following the editorial. I think this editorial and the speeches might well be studied in juxtaposition. Mr. Hearst has written his editorial as a possible solution to the problem as it might look if it were viewed as the earth is viewed from an airplane 6 miles up in the sky. The speeches contain some of the details of a solution which appeared to me when I viewed the German problem from a much lower level, and some time ago. Both the editorial and the speeches focus on the same fundamental problem. Both represent an effort to find a way to a peaceful solution of a dangerous and highly complex difficulty. I do not know to what extent the solution proposed by Mr. Hearst may have applicability to the present situation; but I, for one, welcome its addition as a most helpful contribution to the discussion of this issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LOOK AT GERMANY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

LOS ANGELES.—Flying across our country at 600 miles an hour, 6 miles above the earth, puts everything down below you in a different perspective.

Big cities become villages—great lakes shrink to ponds—enormous valleys of the Midwestern States become merely a patchwork quilt—the magnificent snow-covered Rocky Mountains just white ridges—the Grand Canyon only a jagged crack in the desert.

As for people: They are so small you can't even see them.

Gradually it occurred to me that if everything we think of as big down there is really relatively small, so perhaps are the problems. Perhaps, if you get far enough away from everything, you will see it in a different way. So I mused.

Take for instance Berlin and Germany. The root of the problem is that it is our city in their territory. It is obvious that we can't move the city—but can we remove the boundaries? In other words: reunify, reunite Germany.

Now there is nothing new in that, I know. So let's look closer at why we don't do it.

The reason, as everyone knows, is that the Russians say they won't stand for a reunified Germany. And why won't they? (Well for once they are telling the truth when they admit that they fear a reunified, re-armed Germany.)

The key word there is rearmed. So what about a unified, unarmed Germany?

The Russian forces could be lined up on its eastern border and NATO on its western border; and, should either side be tempted to take advantage of the situation, the opposite side would pitch in. After all, that situation exists today.

Thinking of an unarmed, united Germany, the idea of its being a sort of ward of the United Nations came to mind. And with a united Germany, why not make Berlin the headquarters for the United Nations Organization?

It would, I think, further dissuade anyone so inclined from making a pass at the territory.

Visionary? Perhaps, but remember that the most constant threat to world peace is the nose-against-nose contact of the free and Communist worlds in Germany, which makes any idea worth considering.

There may be plenty of holes in the practical application of this one, but it is a way of pulling the smoldering fuse from the bomb of Germany.

Let's do a little speculation on the whys and hows of a United Nations Germany.

Start by facing the need for doing something about the German question before it does something to us.

The Germans are a notably energetic, industrious people with a record in this century of high competence in peace and war. Perhaps the bitter defeat of their aggressive role in two world conflicts has taught them that conquest by arms won't work.

Geographically you cannot take Germany out of the military arena, so why not take the military arena out of Germany?

A hint of how well that could possibly work can be found in Austria, where East and West stood glaring toe to toe after World War II until a successful agreement to neutralize the country was signed in 1955. The treaty by which the same powers as now occupy Berlin gave Austria independence also guaranteed democratic government and military neutrality.

To show how much that meant to the Russians, they created their satellite organization, the Warsaw pact, 1 day before Austrian independence.

Austria hasn't been a problem since then, and Messrs. Kennedy and Khrushchev can move in and out of Vienna with nobody getting alarmed.

The German problem is more tense and disentanglement would be more delicate. But it would be folly therefore to shrug it off as insoluble and remain indefinitely in slugging stance.

A main purpose of neutralizing Germany politically and economically as U.N. territory would be to remove the hostile armed forces of East and West to points separated by the width of the country. But let's not believe we could neutralize the minds of the German people as individuals.

They would continue to have sympathies, and the odds are most of them would sympathize with the West. They should be allowed to express their sympathies by serving in the armed forces of the external regional groups—either NATO to the West or the Warsaw pact to the East.

In fact it would be to the West's disadvantage to rule that out, for, as things are today, the West Germans are a mainstay of NATO.

As for a U.N.-governed Germany itself, it seems to me it would be proper to have a permanent U.N. armed force based there as the only armed force on German soil, available for such trouble-shooting tasks as the U.N. now must call on volunteer nations for—like the trouble in the Congo.

Another problem would be that Germany, relieved of the economic burden of armament, would have too big an edge over other nations in world trade. After all, it was the postwar disarmed period that helped give West Germany its present prosperity.

Why not just have a United Nations Germany, instead of maintaining its own national armaments, pay the tab for a U.N. armed force? That would also take care of the recurrent U.N. financial crisis of paying for task forces.

As I mentioned at the start, this is an idea literally from out of the blue. Utopian it may be, but the core of it seems to me like a possible way out of the continuing dilemma of Germany. Surely all the approaches to the problem so far have failed to relax U.S.-Soviet tension. A fresh look can't hurt.

THE COMING CRISIS IN GERMANY

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks with this assurance to the Senate: I am not an alarmist. I measure

most carefully the words I am about to speak. In that context, I express to the Senate my belief that just ahead lies the most critical period which the United States will have had to face since the conflict in Korea.

The crisis, Mr. President, is coming in Germany. Specifically, it is coming in Berlin. Indeed, it may have already begun. For years now, the seeds of that crisis have lain dormant in a divided Germany. They have been held in check only by a kind of mutual acquiescence. The Western Powers have not wished to disturb the seeming stability in Germany. Since the Berlin blockade, the Soviet Union has not seriously threatened it. A few years ago, uprisings of East Germans shook the stability, but did not break it.

Those who have thought at all about the German situation have known for a long time that the surface calm would not last. The existence of two German authorities in what is one Germany has been, from the end of World War II, a makeshift arrangement. The Western Powers have recognized it. The Soviet Union has acknowledged it. The German leaders know it.

The key question has never been, Will Germany be unified? The question has long been, When and how will Germany be unified? Those of us who have urged an initiative in American policy with respect to Germany have been aware of this distinction. When I addressed myself to this subject in the Senate in May 1958, I had the distinction very much in mind. Because I did, I tried to deal in the specifics of an American initiative. In suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho.

MR. CHURCH. I wish to apologize for interrupting so soon the remarks of the Senator from Montana, because I believe that the address he is delivering will be a most significant one. But I wish to say that, characteristically, in his opening remarks the Senator from Montana has pierced to the nub of the issue. Conditions in Germany are going to change. Germany will not indefinitely remain divided against itself. Germany will not indefinitely continue to be garrisoned by foreign troops.

It seems to me that those who say our foreign policy must be inflexible overlook the fact that ours is not a static world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana rendered us a service when, a year ago, he emphasized the fact that conditions in Germany would be changing, and that we must be prepared to face up to those changes if we are to cope effectively with them. Flexibility in our foreign policy is a must. A steel blade bends. Pig iron breaks.

I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for coming forward at this stage in the developing Berlin crisis with a speech which will be helpful in giving guidance to all of us, to the President, and to the Secretary of State, in our common effort to solve that crisis for the benefit of the free world.

MR. MANSFIELD. I thank my friend from Idaho.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?

MR. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, we have just returned to this Chamber from a most impressive joint session with the other body, in connection with the celebration of the

150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. At the joint session, during a brilliant address by the great writer and poet, Carl Sandburg, he had occasion to quote a sentence from Abraham Lincoln, which I believe is pertinent today in connection with the splendid address which my friend, the Senator from Montana, is making on the German question. Lincoln said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present."

I wish to congratulate my friend, the Senator from Montana, for the fine address he is making on the German problem.

However, I would not be true to myself if I did not register a slight dissent from some of the comments which have been made with respect to the Secretary of State.

It is unpleasant and unrewarding to say unkind things about a man who is in physical pain, who has shown great physical courage, who is unquestionably a patriot, who is a man of great dedication to the public interest; but I would feel untrue to myself if I did not register on the floor of the Senate a dissent to the statement that he is indispensable to the conduct of our foreign policy in the immediate future. I call attention to what I have said on other occasions with respect to this matter.

I hope that these comments will be taken in good part, and that it will be understood that I make them only because I cannot remain silent when it might be indicated that I was in accord with what has been said.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

MR. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has just said. I commend him for his honesty and his integrity. Of course, I recognize that it is not a new viewpoint on his part, but that he has been consistent in his views in this respect for some time. I would point out, however, that the immediate danger, as I see it, is the Berlin and the German situation. No one knows more about those situations at the present time or is better prepared to lead the allies in meeting them than is the Secretary of State. On that basis, as well as on other bases, I wish him well. I wish him a speedy recovery. I anticipate that in the not too distant future he will resume his duties, and will act, not as his own agent, but as the agent of the President of the United States, in conducting foreign policy.

MR. CLARK. Obviously, I do not wish to engage in a colloquy of extended duration with my colleague at this time. I should like to be recorded as very much hoping and praying for Mr. Dulles' immediate recovery; but I cannot agree that there are not in the State Department others as well or better qualified than the Secretary to carry on the German negotiations. I appreciate that this is a situation on which the distinguished Senator from Montana and I disagree. I shall desist from further comment on this particular phase.

MR. MANSFIELD. I shall desist, also.

MR. President, I repeat, in suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

We did nothing, Mr. President. We took no initiative. We went on in the familiar vacuousness, in the familiar patterns of policy patterns devised years ago, in another setting, under another administration. We did not face the fact that that policy was adequate to maintain a semblance of stability in Germany only so long as all directly concerned acquiesced in the continued division of that nation.

That is water under the bridge. We did not choose to act in a positive fashion to

change the status quo. Now, the Russians have chosen to break it. They have chosen to make the break at Berlin. They have said, in effect, that, after the spring of 1959, the situation will no longer be as it has been in that city. They are quite right, Mr. President. Things will no longer be the same in Berlin or anywhere in Germany. If there is any certainty, it is that the situation in Germany at the close of 1959 will be far different from the present situation. We are approaching the beginning of the end, the beginning of the end of two Berlins and of two Germanys.

The question, as I have already observed, was never, Would Germany be unified? It was, When and how would Germany be unified? We may now have begun to comprehend the when; the actual process of unification is likely to begin this year. Only one question remains: How is Germany to be unified? Will it be by conflict, by negotiation, or by some mixture of the two? That is the question which is impelling us and the rest of the world toward the coming crisis in Germany.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE GERMAN CRISIS

The responsibility for establishing binding foreign policies to deal with the impending crisis, the coming change in Germany, rests with the President and his Secretary of State. Let there be no doubt on that score, in this body, at home, in the executive branch, or abroad. It is not for the Senate to direct the President in this matter. The President will have to make his own decisions, with the assistance of the vast resources of the executive branch. When he speaks officially on Germany, however, he will be speaking for all of us, whether or not we agree with what he says. There is no other way under the constitutional system of the United States.

To say that is not to constrain upon the Senate a silence in these matters. On the contrary, since we shall be bound, since the people of the United States shall be bound, by what the President and his Secretary of State do or fail to do in the coming crisis, the obligation of the Senate to debate, to discuss, and to advise is real and it is compelling.

The Senate of the 86th Congress was not constituted so that it might ignore pressing domestic questions. How much less, then, can we remain silent on the life-and-death matters of foreign policy? The President and the Secretary of State have given no indication that they would have this body turn its back on the crisis in Germany. On the contrary, I note that the Secretary of State has already sought counsel of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Fulbright]. I commend the Secretary for his initiative. The brilliant chairman of the committee has much to contribute to the development of policy for the situation in Germany.

If the Senate is to meet its responsibilities, Mr. President, we must form, through debate and discussion, an understanding of the situation as it is, and as it is evolving in Germany. We must also discern clearly the stakes of the people of the United States and of freedom in that situation. We must advance, finally, ideas for consideration in formulating the foreign policies which are to safeguard the vital interests of our people.

These are the thoughts which have led me to these remarks on the coming crisis in Germany. I make them in the spirit of responsible Democratic cooperation with a Republican administration in a matter of vital concern to all the people of the United States.

TWO GERMAN AUTHORITIES IN ONE GERMANY

Let me begin by exploring the significant realities in Germany, as I see them. The basic reality, Mr. President, is that there are two political authorities in one Germany.

That is a contradiction which cannot and will not stand. There is one Germany. And there are compelling historic and practical reasons which require that the unity of that nation begin to emerge without delay if there is to be peace in Europe and in the world.

I stress the point, Mr. President, that when we speak of the two Germanies we are really speaking not of two nations but of two political authorities. Each of these authorities presumes that it is the wave of the future in all Germany. Each seeks to draw the whole of the German people into its orbit.

To be sure, there are profound differences between the West German Government in Bonn and the East German Communist regime in Pankow. The Bonn government is based upon principles and practices of democracy which are consonant with those of other Western nations and are expressly supported by the inhabitants of West Germany. The Pankow regime exists by the methods of authoritarianism which come from the East. Its source of authority lies in the will to power of those who wield the authority and the acquiescence—however sullen—of the repressed people of East Germany. Its survival depends, to a far greater degree than anything we know in the Western democracies, on military and police power—its own and the Soviet Union's.

The West German democratic government exists. It is there, at Bonn, and the Communists are not going to wish it away or subvert it away. It is going to stay as long as the people in that zone sustain it and as long as the Western nations remain committed to its protection against military aggression from the East. We cannot ignore the fact, however, that the East German regime also exists. It is there at Pankow, and German Communists run it, even though Russians may pull the strings from behind the curtain. Unfortunately, I see no evidence that the Western nations are going to wish away or subvert that East German political authority in the practicable future.

If neither side can be wished away, or subverted away, how then is the division of Germany going to be made to disappear? How is a unified Germany, this essential Germany, this inevitable Germany, going to emerge? There was a time, perhaps, when it might have been reasonable to hope that the Russians and German Communists would soon find it too costly to maintain their control in East Germany. For years we have waited for this promised development. We have waited for the Russians and their camp-followers to fold their tents and steal away.

What we must ask ourselves now is whether there is any realistic basis for hoping that this development will come about in the practicable future? I regret to say that such public indications as there are suggest that the Pankow regime, with Soviet support, is consolidating its position, that its authoritarian hold on East Germany is, if anything, more secure today than it was a few years ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the last thought expressed, the Senator from Montana has stated that the authoritarian hold on East Germany is now greater than it was before. Will the Senator deal a little more in detail with that, and state whether the hold is the result of the power of the Communists, or whether it is the will of the people that they be held by the Communists?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should be delighted to try to answer my distinguished friend from Ohio. I can say, of course, without equivocation that the present status is not the desire or the will of the people. The source of my statement is the U.S. News & World Report, the issue of February 13, 1959.

I read from page 67, at the bottom:

"East Germany's Communist government has just published official figures on its planned expenditures for 1959."

Before I read further I wish to say that all the information I have in my presentation has appeared in the public print. There is nothing secret or official about what I am saying, and it simply represents one Senator's opinion as to what I think is the most difficult and dangerous question of today.

I continue with the quotation from the U.S. News & World Report:

"West German financial experts, looking into the Reds' figures, in the budget and out of it, make a startling discovery."

Military spending by the East German Reds in 1959 is to be 30 percent higher than military spending planned by West Germany. Yet the Reds say that West Germany is threatening the peace of the world."

That is what I mean when I say that the Pankow regime is more secure, not in a political sense but in a military sense. They have been strengthening themselves on a military and paramilitary basis. Of course, the 22 to 28 Soviet divisions are still in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator. My inclination would be to believe that the people of East Germany, if they had the opportunity, would unshackle themselves of the hold which the Soviet has upon them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have been told that the figure would run as high as 95 to 96 percent of the East Germans who, if they had the opportunity to vote, would vote against the present Ulbricht regime.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the fact is that the Soviets and those of East Berlin who agree with the Soviets are applying constantly heavier pressure in the development of the military?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is all very well to hope, as a general principle, for the disappearance of totalitarianism. We have held that principle for decades, but we have also had to live in a world which has contained since its beginning and still contains many totalitarian regimes.

No, Mr. President, a valid policy on Germany, now, must be built on more than the hope of the eventual disappearance of German totalitarianism. It can only be built on the premise that Germany, in one way or another, is going to unify and it is going to begin to unify soon. Further, it can only be built on the premise that that unity in Germany, if it is to come in peace, is likely to fall short of the ultimate goals set for it by both the Communist nations and the free nations—the goal, on the one hand, of a Communist totalitarian Germany, and the goal, on the other, of a fully representative democracy in all Germany.

Until a few months ago there might have been a possibility of evading that reality for a while longer by assuming that the status quo of division in Germany might go on indefinitely. But the prospect of evasion is now narrowing rapidly in the wake of Mr. Khrushchev's announcement of the coming Soviet withdrawal from Berlin. The blunt fact is that soon either negotiations leading to German unification in peace shall begin in earnest or there shall begin in earnest the use of force to that end.

BERLIN—THE CORE OF THE COMING CRISIS

This brings me to a second matter which we must explore, Mr. President, if we are to see our way clearly in the impending crisis. That is the question of Berlin. It is at Berlin, divided Berlin, and along the western routes of access to the city, that the first indications of the conflict leading to war or the success of negotiations leading to stable peace are likely to appear in the coming months.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the historic circumstances surrounding the present difficulties of the Western position in Berlin. It is simple enough to find fault with what was done or not done by political and military leaders years ago. It is as easy, as it is pompous, to pass angry judgments on others, with the prop of hindsight. That process will serve no useful purpose in this situation.

Nor shall I take the time of the Senate to review the legal status of our position in Berlin. Some may find solace for our difficulties in legalism. Even the Russians sought justification for their actions in it. But legalism is at best a dubious way to deal with an explosive situation, when there are, as there are in this situation, two opposing judges, two opposing judgments, and two opposing instruments of mass destruction for enforcing the judgments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from Montana would discuss in a little greater detail the element of legalism being introduced. I have my own understanding of it. I think we are advocating the proposition that there are certain legal obligations rooted in agreements which we have made in the past, and that in making our demands we insist upon adherence to those obligations. Does the Senator mind discussing that question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Ohio is correct. References have been made to the agreements made at Potsdam relative to the occupation of Berlin.

References have been made to the agreement entered into by Gen. Lucius Clay, at that time commander of our forces in Germany, with the Soviet authorities, by means of which we were guaranteed by the Soviet authorities access by rail, by road, and by air, from the western zones in Germany into the western sectors of Berlin.

Then, as I recall—and I believe the Senator will corroborate me on this—some sort of agreement was made by Mr. Phillip Jessup and a Russian representative whose name I cannot recall at the moment, which agreement Mayor Willy Brandt brought to our attention at the luncheon held in the Foreign Relations Committee room the other day. If I remember correctly, he stated that out of these Jessup-Russian consultations and agreements, which brought an end to the need for the allied airlift into Berlin, also came an agreement that we be allowed continued access. He suggested that we look into the agreement to which he referred as the agreement of 1949. Unfortunately I have not had an opportunity to do so yet.

But there are these agreements, or alleged agreements, which give us the right to go in and to maintain access between the western zones and the west sector of Berlin.

The Russians predicate their claims on similar agreements, which they say were made at Potsdam and elsewhere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the position of the Senator from Montana, then, that the problem is more involved and far graver in its possible consequences to world peace than mere adherence to those agreements would justify. We must go beyond that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct, because in my opinion the potentials involved in this situation are terrible and tremendous.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not much matter now how we got to Berlin, or why the Russians have no legal right to ask us to leave. What does matter, Mr. President, is why we need to stay in Berlin, and stay there we must. We are, bluntly, in a highly difficult and dangerous position in Berlin. Great sacrifices may be entailed in remaining. We had better understand clearly now the sig-

nificance of maintaining our position there. We had better understand now what is vital and what is not vital in that position to the people of the United States and to freedom.

The administration has responded to the Russian proposals on Berlin by reiterating a longstanding view of the Nation. It has said, as the Democratic administration before it said, that we will not be driven from the city. The position of this Government, to stand firm in Berlin, has been endorsed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike in the Senate.

It is a sound position. Only it is not enough. It is not enough to say, Mr. President, that we are standing fast in Berlin. That is a slogan, not a policy. Nor is it enough, Mr. President, to stand fast merely to demonstrate our determination to maintain our legal interpretation of the situation as against the Soviet Union's.

Nor is it enough to say that we stand fast in Berlin so that we may continue to demonstrate in the heart of Communist Germany the material superiority of freedom or free enterprise over Communist collectivism. To be sure, there is a striking contrast between West Berlin and East Berlin, but I doubt very much that the people of the United States will countenance the sacrifice of a single human life for the purposes of propagandistic demonstrations in Berlin. And before this year is out many lives may have been spent in Berlin.

No, Mr. President, it is not for reasons of legalism or propaganda that we stand fast in Berlin. The Western nations are in Berlin because Berlin belongs neither to East Germany nor West Germany; it belongs to all the German people. We are in Berlin because some Germans may not look to Bonn and others to Pankow for leadership, but all Germans will soon look to Berlin. We are in Berlin to see to it that when that city is once again the capital of all Germany, as it surely will be, the concept of freedom in peace will not be absent from the scene. If that concept were to disappear from Berlin, the citadel of German nationalism, sooner or later it would disappear from all Germany. Then, sooner or later, the torch would be lit in Germany, whether by German hands or some others, to set Europe and the world aflame once again. That torch was lit twice in Berlin in the past, and twice the world has paid an enormous human price. To see that it is not lit again is in the essential, the vital interest of this generation and future generations of the people of the United States.

That, Mr. President, is the reason which beyond all others, justifies the taking of the great risks which we may soon be called upon to take at Berlin and along the western routes to the city. We are in Berlin in order to get out, but to get out only on condition that the German political forces which stand for freedom in peace have a sure footing and equal chance to survive and to grow on their merits in the future capital of all Germany.

I support fully the position of this administration on the necessity of standing fast in Berlin. I question, however, the adequacy with which we have related that position to the changing situation in Germany. I question a policy which provides that not only do we stand fast in Berlin, but also implores or demands that the Russians stand fast. After years of trying to get the Russians out of the innumerable places into which they sprawled after World War II, it is indeed strange to hear that we are insisting that the Russians must not, indeed cannot, leave Berlin. That is a most peculiar position to say the least; and the Russians obviously have no intention of obliging us by remaining.

It is clear what is afoot there. In a few months hence, the Russians will leave East

Berlin despite our demands or urging to the contrary. East Berlin will then be, once again, a German city—Communist, to be sure, but, nevertheless, German. By contrast, West Berlin will retain the appearance it now has, the appearance of a Western enclave in the heart of Germany, for there are thousands of Allied officials and military personnel in the area. The contrast will not be lost on German nationalists in East or West Germany.

Further, Mr. President, if we are to hold this enclave without struggle, it will be at the sufferance of the East German Communist authorities. If they do not choose to accommodate us, then we shall in all probability have to fight our way through to Berlin, not against Russians, but against Germans. Even if this course does not lead to a great conflict, the repercussions in Germany will be profound. Among Germans, as among others, blood may prove thicker than ideologies.

As I said, there can be no quarrel with the need to stand fast in Berlin. I do question, however, a policy which does not anticipate the developments which I have just outlined and fails to take steps to mitigate them.

I question, too, a policy which presumes as our policy does that the Great Powers of World War II—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—can bring about German unification. There may have been a time when such a course was possible. If it ever existed, however, it was years ago when Germany lay devastated and prostrate. It was years ago, in the freshness of the common sacrifices of World War II and in the measure of mutual respect and tolerance which these sacrifices engendered.

Those years are gone. The time is not today. Today, there is little respect between this Nation and the Soviet Union except the fearful respect which the military power of the one may generate in the other. Today, Germany is neither devastated nor prostrate; it has become once again the most dynamic nation in Western Europe.

No, Mr. President, the erstwhile Allies, the divided Allies of World War II, are not in a position to ordain a unification in peace for a revitalized Germany. At most, they may be able to contribute to that unification by rethinking their own security needs in anticipation of its inevitable development. At most, they may be able to contribute to unification by exercising such influence as they may possess to encourage the Germans themselves to reach a reasonable procedure on unification and by sanctioning that procedure if it is sound. It is the Germans, themselves, however, who will make the decisive decisions on unification, if they are to be made in peace.

FREE ALL-GERMAN ELECTIONS

Further, Mr. President, I question, in present circumstances, a policy which presumes to lead to the peaceful unification of Germany solely on the basis of free, all-German elections. I say now what I said last May on this point, only with more emphasis. Events have moved a long way since this policy was devised and the bell no longer has an altogether recognizable sound when it is rung over and over again in the same fashion. A German political authority has emerged in the West. Another political structure has appeared in the East which is manned by Germans, even if it is not directed by them. Whatever we may think of this structure, there is no reliable indication that it is going to go away peacefully, of its own accord.

There are now military and paramilitary German forces in both East and West Germany. How are these forces to be integrated in peace? Is this a problem that can be solved by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by the Germans who officer these opposing forces?

There are differing economic and social structures functioning in Western and Eastern Germany. How are these structures to be fused in peace? Can they be harmonized by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by those Germans who operate them?

I cite these problems as examples. There are no doubt others of a similar nature. A policy which advances no thought on how they are to be met does not begin to meet the realities of the German situation. If the unification of Germany is essential and inevitable and if it is neither our responsibility nor in the interest of this Nation to seek that unity by force, then I submit that a policy which merely clings to an unrealizable slogan of free all-German elections, which does not pursue German unification by other means, is no policy at all. It is a straitjacket. It is an excuse for immobility. It may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict of disastrous diplomatic retreat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take it, from what the Senator has stated, that the efforts to procure an overall election of citizens of East and West Germany have thus far proved to be futile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The East Germans will not consent to have an election under which their people can give expression to the type of government they want. Based upon the fact that that objective is an unrealizable objective, an overall free election, the Senator from Montana suggests that other means should be explored to procure a solution of the problem. I wish the Senator would comment on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the position of the Western Powers on the question of all-German elections is one which stands no possibility in the immediate future, and perhaps in the indefinite future, of achieving any degree of success. Therefore we should try to work out other means.

As I shall indicate in the course of my speech, there are contacts in existence between the East German Government and the West German Government. These contacts are made on an interzonal basis, and are tied up with commercial intercourse and trade commitments. I would hope that in considering the idea of elections, we might be able to explore, perhaps, ideas other than all-German elections, even though they are the most desirable, and I should like to see them come to pass, and we might try to break it down—and the sooner the better—so that the East Germans could express themselves at the polls, perhaps just in East Germany, and declare to the world where they want to go. In that way they might get out from under the yoke the Ulbricht government, which is exercising despotic and complete control over 17 million Germans in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Montana clarifies my mind on the subject. In other words, all of us want a free election under which the people themselves would decide the type of government they desire to have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, every effort in that direction has been rebuffed, and it is therefore necessary to find other means of trying to reach an agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the idea. The Senator is correct. Every effort to achieve an all-German election has failed because of the insistent and dogmatic "nyet" of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly the position of the Senator from Montana to

be that, while he adheres to what we have advocated so long, that is, free elections for all of Germany, and the idea of a unified Germany, he recognizes the very practical difficulty of having that under present conditions? Therefore he says that perhaps we ought to make ourselves more flexible and start exploring some other way, and that there might be held a separate election in East Germany and a separate election in West Germany, and thus perhaps there could be agreement upon some kind of independent government in each of the two areas, with the idea that eventually, as he says, because blood is thicker than water, with teamwork the two temporary Germanys will combine themselves into one overall united Germany some time in the future, even though we know not how far in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of my speech today is to suggest, respectfully and constructively, some possible alternative which may be of value to the Department of State, or out of which may come ideas which would be worthwhile toward the bringing about of a solution to this most difficult problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Montana. He spoke about the rigidity of our position in the past. Undoubtedly it has been rather rigid, so rigid that perhaps our country, as well as a great part of the world, was rather shocked recently when Secretary Dulles suggested there might be more flexibility than we have given to the idea, and when he suggested there might be methods other than free elections for the solution of the problem. Is it not true, and would not the Senator agree with me in this, that perhaps we have oversimplified the matter in assuming that a reunification could be easily brought about between the two Germanys?

I may say that about 3 years ago I had the pleasure of attending an international conference at Garmisch in Germany. The conference was made up of people from all the NATO countries, representatives of governments, officials, business people, economists, Members of Parliament, and so on, and one of the German Ministers with whom I had quite a long talk made the point to me, the first time I had ever heard it mentioned, that reunification is not a simple matter. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Montana, it might have been a relatively simple matter several years ago, right after the war. But since that time the two Germanys have grown away from the conditions which the Senator has so well described in his speech. They have grown away from some of the incentives which might have pushed them together.

Furthermore, different enactments have taken place. For instance, the Minister of the Bonn government said to me, "This may sound strange, coming from me, but East Germany has a social security system which in many respects is better than ours."

Mr. MANSFIELD. It also antedates our own. Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Although I was speaking of the social security of West Germany, it is also true that theirs antedates ours, too.

East Germany has a system which is in many respects better than that in West Germany, so the East Germans could not be asked to give up their system of social security, workmen's compensation, and land reform.

The Senator from Montana, I believe, heard me ask the mayor of West Berlin the other day that very question, and he heard the mayor's comments, to the effect that to bring the two Germanys together, whenever it may be done, will necessitate the resolving of differences and the making of allowances between the two governments. As I understand, that is exactly what the Senator is talking about. He is speaking of the necessity on the part of those con-

cerned to be ready to consider and to negotiate with reference to all the changes which have taken place throughout the years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Montana for making this very able speech and calling to our attention a matter which is not only of tremendous importance but also of great timeliness. After all, the ultimatum will expire on May 28, which is not far off. It has been suggested since the ultimatum was made that perhaps there will not be absolute adherence to that exact date. Nevertheless, we are approaching the day when Russia will leave Berlin.

I think the Senator is correct in saying that Russia will leave, and that the United States will be placed in a rather ridiculous position if we try to keep Russia there, when, as a matter of fact, we have been saying to the world for many years that she should get out of the different countries which she occupies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has already withdrawn some of its troops and a considerable number of the dependents of those troops. So it does not appear that Russia was fooling when it delivered its ultimatum. I hope that the United States will do, as I feel certain we are doing, everything possible to develop alternatives and to consider ways and means to meet the situation, if and when it arises, when the deadline occurs, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, on May 27.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from Montana is exactly correct. Certainly we should be exploring all the alternatives. I think the Senator will agree with me that we ought not simply, easily, and quickly reject any proposal which is made, but that we should be willing to let the world know that we are willing to sit down and negotiate concerning every proposal which may come from either side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I hope both the Soviet Union and the United States will get away from the automatic reactions of the proposals which one country makes to the other. Usually the answer is an automatic "No." Once in a while "Maybe" or a "Perhaps" and occasionally a "Yes" would be useful. I think in that way we might begin, at least on the marginal level, to do away with some of the differences. If we can do that, perhaps we can work our way upward to an eventual solution of the bigger problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The other day, in the talk with the mayor of West Berlin, I was greatly encouraged by his reasonableness in wanting to explore every avenue which might lead us out of darkness into the light and to an assured peace for those people. May I ask the Senator from Montana if he has given any consideration to the ability of the Soviet Union, after it has once withdrawn its troops, to jump in again because of its closeness to this area of East Berlin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have, indeed. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall discuss that subject briefly when I come to the ninth point in my recommendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MILITARY WITHDRAWAL IN GERMANY AND CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Finally, Mr. President, I question a policy which appears to regard as sacrosanct present military arrangements in Germany and Central Europe. I can understand, I can accept, I can support the concept that Western Germany's ties with Western Europe are essential to the peace of Europe and they must not be broken. Within that concept, however, I cannot comprehend a view which seems to hold inflexibly to the

present form and extent of German rearmament. We have accepted and even encouraged rises in the German military contribution to NATO in certain circumstances in the past. I do not see that we cannot accept and encourage declines in that contribution in other circumstances in the future.

Security needs are ever-changing needs. Western German rearmament is not an end in itself. It is for the purpose of the defense of German freedom in common with the defense of the freedom of the Western community. It is not for the purpose of keeping rigid the tables of organization and the projections of presumed needs by the military command of NATO. These projections, in any event, have not been met for years and the world has not yet come to an end.

The nature and extent of German rearmament and of non-German armaments on German soil, in short, is one area of the problem of unification in which reasonable proposals for negotiation, wherever they may originate, ought not to be rejected out of hand. That is especially the case if these proposals are related to the reduction of military power throughout central Europe. I know full well that the Russians may have no intention of withdrawing from the Eastern European States in any circumstances. Nevertheless, I can see no reason to make it easier for them to justify their remaining by a seeming intransigence on our part. I cannot see that the road to the eventual freedom of states like Poland and Czechoslovakia is made easier by such a process.

RUSSIAN ROLE IN THE COMING CRISIS

Mr. President, let me turn now to the question of Russian intentions in the coming crisis in Germany. In this matter there is only one certain course. Whatever they may do, we must assume that the Russians are acting to enhance the position of the Soviet Union and that of totalitarian communism throughout Germany and Europe. We must also assume that they will use whatever methods they believe will lead to these ends, not excluding aggressive war. The Russians may blow hot or they may blow cold. They may down a plane on their border one day. They may release a blocked convoy the next. We cannot know with certainty why they act as they act at any given moment.

We cannot know with certainty the purport of Mr. Mikoyan's recent visit to the United States. We cannot know with certainty the meaning of Mr. Khrushchev's comments on a thaw in the cold war. They may be meant to provide a setting for successful negotiations. They may be meant simply to confuse or beguile.

If they do confuse, if they do beguile, however, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves. We ought to be able by this time, years after the ill-fated Geneva Conference of 1955, to distinguish between the conciliatory gesture and the act of conciliation. Those of us who come from the cold country have learned through bitter experience that winter thaws can be followed by summer frosts. The promise of spring in February is not the same as the coming of spring in May.

There is, as I say, no way of knowing with certainty what some particular Soviet gesture or other signifies. What we can know, Mr. President, is that they are all, good or bad, peripheral to the crisis which is coming in Germany. Mr. Mikoyan's visit is not going to free us from that crisis. Mr. Khrushchev's thaws will not do it. Increased Soviet-American trade has little relation to it.

If we are to be prepared to face this crisis in Germany it will be best not to become distracted or obsessed by the twists and turns of Soviet behavior. It will be best to keep our eyes on Germany. The fundamental question of policy for us is not so much what the Russians are looking for in

Germany. We know what they are looking for; and they may very well seize it while we amuse or fascinate ourselves by trying to interpret the charades of Russian behavior.

No, Mr. President; more important, far more important, to us is to know what we ourselves are seeking in Germany. We must bring to this crisis not only courage, but also conviction. We must bring to it a positive and understandable policy which meets our essential national needs and the essential needs of freedom.

THE ESSENTIALS OF A WESTERN POLICY IN THE COMING CRISIS

As I noted earlier in my remarks, it is not for the Senate to direct the President and the Secretary of State in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. But it is a responsibility of Senators to try to contribute constructively—and I wish to repeat the word "constructively"—to the policies which govern those relations. It is in that sense, Mr. President, that I seek, in these final comments, to express the thoughts which this exploration suggests—thoughts on the essentials of a sound Western policy for the coming crisis in Germany. I have no crystal ball. I have no secret information. I have not been coached by anyone, nor have I been asked by anyone to deliver this speech. What I suggest may not be valid in the light of the greater understanding of others. It is one Senator's views, based upon what he has read, what he has heard, what he has tried to reason. It is, in short, the course which suggests itself to me on the basis of the understanding which I have been able to draw out of the confusion and complexity of the German situation. I can be—and may well be—wrong; and I stand ready to accept a better illumination of the problem through discussion and debate in the Senate. For whatever they may be worth, however, I outline the following points as essentials of a sound Western policy on Germany.

First. It is essential, Mr. President, that forces representing the concept of freedom in peace not be driven out of Berlin. They need, at the least, to remain on a basis of equality with the forces of totalitarian communism in the future capital of Germany. If those forces are to have a chance to remain in peace, a Western initiative for peace is essential.

Second. It is time to call upon German leaders of the two Berlin communities—East and West—to begin serious efforts to unify the municipal government and public services of that city.

Third. To that end, Mr. President, it would be helpful to enlist the conciliatory services of the Secretary General of the United Nations. If agreement can be reached by East Germany and West Germany to establish an all-Berlin government, then it will be desirable to replace both Soviet and Allied forces with a United Nations interim police force composed of contingents from nations not directly involved. That force might supervise the agreement, and might see to it that all the routes of access to the city remain open until Berlin once again becomes the capital of a peaceful, unified Germany. It may be that in the Berlin microcosm there may evolve patterns of unification which will be applicable to the larger problem of all-German unification.

Fourth. If this approach or some such approach to a unified, neutralized Berlin fails, Mr. President, then it is essential that the forces representing the concept of freedom in peace in Berlin remain in Berlin, regardless of whether the Russians leave. Let them go, if they will. I would not wish to see this country a party to any insistence that they stay.

Fifth. At the same time, however, the forces representing freedom in Berlin must be Germanized as rapidly as possible. It

is time to think seriously of replacing the thousands of allied military personnel in Berlin with German militia, fully supported by NATO guarantees.

Sixth. Some may regard discussions between Germans of the West and Germans of the East as tantamount to recognition of the East German Communist regime. Some who regard as appeasement not only talk, but even thought, which apparently is alien to them, on the serious problems of the Nation, may even go so far as to label with this stamp of political chicanery any proposals of meetings between East and West Germans. Let them do it, Mr. President; it is their privilege.

But let me say this: If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then we have appeased and recognized Communist China, because a representative of this Government has been talking on its behalf, on and off, for years, with a Chinese Communist representative in Geneva and Warsaw. If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then the West Germans have recognized and appeased Pankow for years. The fact is that East Germans and West Germans have worked out practical agreements of various kinds between the two zones of Germany. As early as 1957, West Germany's exports to East Germany for the year totaled \$201 million. During the first half of 1958, \$125 million in trade moved in each direction. That kind of trade, Mr. President, does not take place without talk.

I do not know what the theory of international law may be. I do not know whether talk is tantamount to recognition. I do know that, as a practical matter, we have talked with, but have not recognized, Communist China. West Germans have talked with and traded with, but have not recognized, Pankow. What is involved in the coming crisis in Germany is not a classroom problem on the theory of international law. It is the life or death problem of peace or war. The stake is the lives of tens of millions of human beings, Americans included.

I cannot see that there is going to be any peaceful solution of this problem without a great deal of talk—between Germans who are in authority in the Federal Republic and Germans who purport to be in authority in the eastern zone. It seems to me essential, moreover, that this talk cover the whole range of problems of unification of the two zones, the whole range of problems involving the harmonizing of the political, economic, and military systems of the two zones.

Seventh. There is a point beyond which the search for peace can lead to the jeopardizing of freedom. Regardless of whatever agreements emerge, it seems to me essential that the people of East Germany have some genuine choice in the form of control which is exercised over them. There must be provision for the protection of the rights of all peaceful political forces in all Germany. All-German elections may not be essential—although I think them highly desirable—but at least there must be a chance for men and women of Eastern Germany, as well as those of Western Germany, to express themselves and their political preferences and to participate in political affairs without the threat of terror.

Whatever may be the details of the fusion of the two zones, they are best left to the Germans of the two zones. The Germans are likely to know better than anyone else what will suit them and what is possible among them. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that at this late date the erstwhile allies of World War II can work out these details on their behalf.

Eighth. The contribution which the Western allies, as well as the Soviet Union, need to make, if there is to be peace, is to guarantee, for a period of time, the kind of unified

Germany which may emerge from discussions among the Germans. What the former allies need to do is to see to it that a unified Germany neither is subjected to military pressures from its neighbors, nor becomes a source of military pressure to its neighbors.

Ninth. To that end, Mr. President, it is essential to include within the scope of our policy the search for agreements which, while they do not compel a severance of West Germany's numerous ties with Western Europe, may lead to limitations of armaments throughout Germany and central Europe. Also needed are agreements which will pull back the so-called ultimate weapons and the armed forces of both East and West from the points of eminent contact in Germany and in central Europe. In short, Mr. President, it seems to me essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany. Perhaps the best way to consider these matters would be to predicate them on reasonable agreements which may emerge from the Geneva Conferences on Surprise Attacks and the Suspension of Nuclear Tests.

Now getting back to what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] mentioned a while ago, he asked, I believe, if I recognized the significance of a pullback and how it would benefit the Soviet Union. I do recognize that in some kinds of pullback the Western Powers would receive the worst of it, but I think we ought to recognize also that if there is to be any possibility of peace, we shall have to make some concessions; this might be one of them. We need to recognize that in so doing, if a withdrawal, based on a reasonable solution were brought about, we would be the ones who would take a loss in position, since the Soviet divisions, in going back to the heartland, would be in striking distance and would be better prepared than we would be to carry on any military activity in that area. But we have to develop give and take by starting from the bottom and working upward. If we do not get out of the position of rigidity, I believe the situation in Berlin and in Germany will become worse, and the bases on which there can be peace will become fewer and fewer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the statement of the Senator. In my opinion, there is a condition existing in which, if the Soviet Government continues to dictate to the government of East Berlin, it will be impossible to bring about a reconciliation of East and West Berlin. Soviet Russia will not tolerate it. Based upon the adamant position of Soviet Russia, and based upon the rigidity of the situation as described by the Senator from Montana, while the matters about which I have spoken are highly desirable, I agree we should look for other avenues to escape the great holocaust which seems to be threatening us in the future. I, for one—and I believe confirmation has been given to this view by the mayor of West Berlin—would want every avenue explored, talks had, continued talks, in the hope that some solution may be found.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I have taken a great deal of the Senate's time today. I have tried not to take it lightly. I have done so because it is clear that this administration, following the example of its predecessor, has committed the Nation to stand fast at Berlin.

It is a resolve well taken. Since we cannot yet perceive to what extremity of sacrifice it may lead in the months ahead, I have felt it essential to try to set forth for

the consideration of the Senate my understanding of what is involved in the coming crisis in Germany. I am grateful that in this crucial time the Senate's principal Member in these matters, the outstanding Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is a man with such a deep understanding and intelligent grasp of the international forces that play on the Nation. I hope that he will make his voice heard; I am sure that the President and the Secretary of State will listen most carefully. I would hope, further, that between them will evolve a policy that all of us, as Americans, will be glad to support.

Most important, Mr. President, I hope that the President of the United States, his Secretary of State, and the Congress will fortify the resolve to stand fast in Berlin with the conviction which only a positive policy for peace can give it. The Secretary of State has spoken of mutual concessions. Those are calm and wise words for this moment in time, with the clouds of radioactive death waiting to envelop the earth. I hope, deeply, that they will lead to a positive policy for peace. It is that kind of a policy for which rational men everywhere are waiting. It is that kind of a policy which they will be able to comprehend and to which, if need be, they will be able willingly to consecrate their lives.

The policy has yet to be formed. It needs to be formed soon. If it is formed, the concept of freedom in peace will not perish in Berlin, in Germany, or in the world.

A THIRD WAY ON BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, as anticipated by the President, the talks in Vienna did not produce any significant change in the situation at Berlin. Strip the newspaper accounts of their sensationalism and one thing is clear: The situation in Berlin is where it was in the fall of 1958. It is unchanged despite the Geneva Conference of foreign ministers in 1959. It is unchanged despite the friendly meeting at Camp David in 1959 and the furious meeting in Paris in the aftermath of the U-2 incident. There were no spirals at Vienna, only the hard facts exchanged without embellishment. There was only a high degree of soberness coupled with the personal courtesy of leaders, without which nations cannot hope to find a way to peace, today, any better than when diplomacy first began.

In this sense the Vienna talks were useful. They swept away the chaff. They revealed to both Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy the hard kernel of the problem. They revealed, too, that the problem confronts us in substantially the same form as it did when it first appeared more than 2 years ago.

I suppose we may regard the fact that the situation in Berlin is unchanged after 2 years, and that the crisis has been postponed for 2 years, as some sort of achievement. In early 1959, a military showdown appeared imminent to me, as it did to most observers, unless the policies and attitudes of a decade and a half would begin to change. The showdown did not take place.

It was forestalled by an almost continuous round of subsummit and summit conferences and visitings back and forth and hither and yon. The crisis has stirred again from time to time during this past 2 years but it has not erupted. Because it has not, does not mean that it will not. If the present positions of the parties concerned remain unchanged, sooner or later this crisis postponed, this crisis avoided will cease to lie dormant.

What is involved at Berlin is not some obscure situation, distant from our concern or the concern of the Soviet Union. Berlin is at the core of these concerns. Berlin is the level which may ease Europe toward a more durable security or push the Western nations and the Soviet Union into a new vortex of

irrationality at whose center lies the graveyard of humanity.

In these circumstances, we owe it to ourselves to examine the position which we have assumed with respect to Berlin. The leaders of the Soviet Union are obligated to do the same. Both sides owe it to the people of the world. The responsibility which we have, Madam President, and which the Soviet Union has, is not merely to reassert positions already assumed and which are obviously irreconcilable. The responsibility is to seek to determine whether or not there is a third way on Berlin which corresponds more accurately to the needs of Germany today, Europe today, and the world today—indeed, a third way which meets more fully the contemporary needs of both the Soviet Union and ourselves.

We can make this exploration only if we see clearly what the present positions are and what they imply.

Together with Britain and France, this Nation is pledged to maintain an allied presence in West Berlin and to defend the people of that half city. The other members of the NATO have endorsed this position.

I do not think there is any misunderstanding of what we are pledged to do, either at home or abroad. Nevertheless, let us restate the position to be certain that it is not misunderstood either at home or abroad. Let us restate it without provocation, without bombast. Let us restate it, as I am sure the President did at Vienna, in all soberness: We will not be driven, pushed or barred from fulfilling our responsibilities to ourselves and to freedom in Berlin by any nation, half nation, group of nations or whatever. Such measures as may be necessary to assert that responsibility will be taken.

This is what we say in the phrase: Stand firm at Berlin. The full implications of these four words had better be understood in the Senate, in the Congress, and throughout the Nation. They had better be understood now. The range of this commitment extends from a beginning of words of firmness, to a midpoint of expenditure of immense resources and enormous taxes and other sacrifices, to a final pledge of the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in the Nation. We are not engaged at Berlin with the fast draw and wax bullets of television any more than the Russians are engaged in a harmless game of chess. In the last analysis we are engaged now, as we have been at Berlin, with the whole future of the United States. In this day and age and in this situation, the words "standing firm" carry no other than this ultimate implication.

I say this with no desire to disturb the serenity of the Senate. I say it only that we may be clear on the meaning of the words we use. I say it in order that we may comprehend more accurately the immense burden which rests on the shoulders of the President of the United States. He will make the decisions and he must make them in this awesome context. I trust and I am confident that those of us with public responsibilities—in Government and out and especially the press and other news media—will remain cognizant of this burden during the next few months.

Let me set forth next my understanding of the position to which the Soviet Union adheres in the Berlin situation. It is, so far as I am aware, unchanged as is ours, except in time schedule since it was first announced in November 1958. I should like to state that position in substance without sensationalism and as objectively as I can delineate it from the accounts which have appeared in the press. The Soviet Union intends to withdraw from its World War II occupational responsibilities in East Berlin and it insists that the Western powers must do the same in West Berlin. It proposes to turn over East Berlin to the East German authorities, presumably as part of a separate peace treaty

with the East German government. It offers to join in a guarantee of a new status for West Berlin as a free city within that state. And if I am not mistaken, Mr. Khrushchev has added to this position a further contention that the Soviet Union will come to the military aid of the East German authorities in the event that the Western Powers refuse to accept this change and continue to assert their present responsibilities in West Berlin in opposition to the wishes of those authorities.

These two positions, then, form the substance of the Berlin crisis now dormant but which, at any time, may become active. We insist, in effect, on the continuance of the status quo in Berlin for the present and, presumably until such time as Germany is unified. The Russians are intent upon changing the status quo in a particular fashion in the near future, regardless of the eventual solution of the question of German unification.

I know that we intend to maintain our position. I do not lightly assume that the Soviet Premier does not mean what he says with respect to the position of the Soviet Union, despite the postponements of the actual act of Soviet withdrawal during the months and years since November 1959.

My own view of this situation, however, is not one which depends on whether the Soviet Premier means what he says or does not mean what he says. It is based upon my personal estimate of the changing situation in Europe and the world and it is based upon what I believe to be the rational interests of this Nation in the light of those changes.

I have long questioned and I continue to question a status quo which places us in the position, in effect, of pleading with or urging the Russians not to withdraw their military forces from the westernmost point of penetration which they reached in Europe in the wake of World War II; yet, our present position on Berlin requires that we do precisely that. Further, Madam President, I do not think we can safeguard most effectively our own interests or advance the interests of peace when we insist upon remaining directly under a Communist sword of Damocles, as is now the case in Berlin, if a rational alternative may be found to that position through diplomacy. Further, I have long questioned and I continue to question a position on Berlin which was assumed immediately after World War II and has been maintained unchanged despite the enormous changes which have occurred in both parts of Germany and in Europe since that time.

Finally, I question, as I have long questioned, a position which, through subordinate irresponsibility, error or provocation on either side invites the precipitation of a nuclear conflict.

We prove our courage, our steadfastness, our determination when we insist, as insist we must with all that insistence implies, that we shall not permit the Russians or anyone else to dictate unilaterally the terms under which this Nation and its allies shall discharge the responsibilities which were assumed in Berlin in the wake of World War II. We would prove little more than the inertia of Western leadership, however, if we insist that the status quo in Berlin is sacrosanct. We prove little more than the sterility of our diplomacy if we insist that the status quo at Berlin cannot be changed even by mutual agreement leading to a new situation, which is neither that which now exists nor the alternative which the Soviet Union propounds. It seems to me, Madam President, that if we are to be not merely courageous but intelligently courageous that is precisely the course we must pursue. We must seek a third way in Berlin which may better serve the interests of all the parties concerned—of the German people no less than other Europeans, of the United States no less than the Soviet Union, and of that

great stretch of the world with its hundreds of millions of people to whom Berlin is but a name, if it is even that.

I would not wish to preclude, Madam President, any proposals to this end which may originate in any quarter. Indeed, it would be helpful, in my opinion, if the Senate discussed this matter at length. I suggest, moreover, that this discussion might profitably begin now before the relatively dormant crisis in Berlin comes alive once again. We can think now of its many implications with a measure of detachment and deliberation. If we wait for the moment of heat, it may be too late to think at all.

I repeat, Madam President, I do not wish to preclude any ideas or proposals, regardless of their source, which may promise a rational solution of the problem of Berlin. For my part, however, I believe that the third way lies in an honest recognition of the fact that it is too late in the game to expect that Germany will be reunified in peace by fiat of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia as was expected 15 years ago. Yet, this assumption continues to underlie our position with respect to Berlin. If the assumption is invalid, then the continued garrisoning of Berlin by the forces of these four nations loses much of its significance as a temporary occupational measure which was all it was intended to be when these garrisons were established a decade and a half ago.

However, Berlin—not only West Berlin, but all Berlin—does not lose its significance in terms of ultimate German unification. Berlin remains the symbolic hope of that unification and I do not think it is unreasonable to assume that it will one day again be the actual capital of a unified Germany. It seems to me that the German people will have the best opportunity to find the way to unification in peace and the outside powers will make a significant contribution to the search, if they will act now to remove Berlin—all Berlin—from the clashes of the cold war into which it has been driven by the events of the postwar years. If we must live, as it now seems likely, for an indefinite period with a divided Germany, then, peace requires that Berlin—all Berlin—be held in peace and in trust until the day of unification. Its status must be reconstituted so that Berlin will be the hope for peaceful German unification rather than the prize for German unification by other means which it has now become.

This conversion of Berlin will not occur under Mr. Khrushchev's proposal to turn only West Berlin into a free city. Even if the rights of the Western presence to that half-city were insured beyond a shadow of doubt, even if guarantees of the safety of the Western enclave were inviolate, it does not seem to me that this arrangement would be satisfactory. For it would reduce this enclave to a sleepy quasi-foreign anachronism, and it would leave Berlin—symbolic Berlin, unifying Berlin, Capital Berlin, German Berlin—in the hands of a militant German minority. It would give an enormous and inadmissible amplification throughout Germany to the present small voice of the East German minority government at Pankow. It would invite German nationalism throughout Germany to adhere to the German Communist standard flying in East Berlin. That is a handicap which freedom cannot allow. It is a concession which does not accord with the needs of peace in Germany or the essentials of peaceful competition between communism and freedom.

I do not believe, Madam President, that the way to peace can be found either in the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin or in the change which Mr. Khrushchev proposes. A third way may lie in the creation of a free city, not in West Berlin alone, but in the creation of a free city which embraces all Berlin—the Communist East no

less than the free western segment of that metropolis. Let this whole city be held in trust and in peace by some international authority until such time as it is again the capital of Germany. Let the routes of access to this whole city be garrisoned by international peace teams in the effective pattern of those now operating between Israel and the Arab States. Let this interim status of free city be guaranteed by the NATO and Warsaw-pact countries.

Let Bonn and Pankow subscribe to this arrangement and pay its costs in appropriate shares. Let these changes be incorporated in specific written agreements. Then, perhaps, we may have the beginning of a durable peace in Berlin and the healing of the cleavage in Germany and Europe.

I know, Madam President, that to bring about this change in Berlin after the division of that city has hardened over many years may seem an immensely difficult, political, and diplomatic undertaking. But is it not, really, an infinitesimal task when compared with the full implications of an essay in military solution with what comes after it?

I realize, too, Madam President, that this approach may evoke no response from Mr. Khrushchev. But do Mr. Khrushchev's reactions, whatever they may be, dissolve us from our rational responsibilities to ourselves and to the world in this situation? Do not those responsibilities require us to explore fully and vigorously any and all avenues of peace even as we steel ourselves for what must come if the way to peace cannot be found?

I make these suggestions, Madam President, as one Senator from the State of Montana, and I make them on my own responsibility. I make them in full recognition of the present position of this Government which, if it is unchanged will be my personal position when all the words are exhausted. I make them, however, in the belief that this present position is not enough, even as the present Soviet position is not enough. Our present position on Berlin, even unchallenged by the Soviet Union, leads only in a circle endlessly repeated as it continues to recede from the changing realities of Germany and Europe, until it now promises to become at best irrelevant and at worst a stimulus to catastrophe. The Soviet position on Berlin, unchanged, in my opinion, is also headed toward complete irrelevance unless before that point is reached, it precipitates a military conflict by accident or design.

The implications of what I have tried to say to the Senate, then, are clear. Sooner or later, the Western nations and the Soviet Union must seek a new way, a third way, to solution of the Berlin problem along the lines which I have suggested or some other. Unless this search is pursued with energy and dispatch and to fruition, sooner or later Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster for mankind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPEDITION OF UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Sen-

ate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"Declaration of purpose

"Sec. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

"Grants for surveys

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for any utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction

"Sec. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) That total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a) (2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project,

plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a) (1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term 'construction', as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term 'State educational television agency' means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent

with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'nonprofit community educational television organization' means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission"

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations"

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited"

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the bill, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONROE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NO "TINCUP" FOR US

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Thursday, the House of Representatives

passed a bill to reimburse the New York City police force for extraordinary expenses incurred guarding Khrushchev and Castro in 1960 at the United Nations. As the sponsor of a companion Senate bill, I am delighted that this legislation has passed its first test and I look forward to its consideration in the Senate.

The House bill appropriates \$3,063,500 to the city of New York, representing reimbursement at straight time rates for overtime hours put in by members of the New York City police force during the period of the opening of the 15th General Assembly.

Total cost to the city of New York of this special U.N. service was approximately \$6.5 million, which included overtime pay, clerical, and administrative services and the cost of vehicles and other special precautions. The amount approved by the House would only cover costs which can clearly and without any question be considered as beyond regular operating costs of the city of New York police force.

Mr. President, money cannot repay the policemen of New York for the superb manner in which they carried out their duties at the convening of the 15th General Assembly. They lived up to their reputation as New York's Finest. Many members of the force were away from their homes and families for long hours, day and night. They did an outstanding job in averting the unpleasant incidents ordinarily associated with the presence of so many unpopular Communist leaders. Their efforts constitute a service, not only to the city of New York, but to the Nation as a whole.

True, a share of the responsibility of protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives benefit from its presence there. However, the special and unforeseeable circumstances of 1960 surpassed the city's obligation. Therefore the responsibility must be shared by the Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host country to the United Nations.

Mr. President, this legislation is and has been a completely nonpartisan effort. The principle involved has received the blessing of former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. Bills to reimburse the city of New York have been introduced in the other body by Congressmen RYAN, CELLER, HALPERN, LINDSAY, and Congresswoman KELLY. I introduced the companion measure in the Senate with the active support and cosponsorship of my distinguished senior colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS.

Mr. President, following the introduction of this bill I was in close touch with the Department of State, which has written to me as follows:

There is no doubt that the additional cost of police services imposed upon the city of New York was unprecedented and unforeseen and, for that reason, it would be inappropriate to expect the city to bear this expense in its entirety.

Many will recall the tremendous concern prevailing at the time of Khrushchev's visit to New York. An incident

occurring at that time could inflame and aggravate world tensions and create international havoc.

When Castro arrived at Idlewild Airport the New York Times reported that his cavalcade was led by a motorcycle and a car containing three officers with submachineguns. Two policemen flanked his car, a bus with 60 policemen followed and four patrolmen were stationed at each bridge along the route. Two hundred policemen were waiting at his hotel when he arrived. This is not routine police protection. The average diplomatic visitor to the city of New York, even a head of state does not receive or require such heavy protective efforts.

Mr. President, when this measure was debated in the House one of its opponents said that the torch held by the Statue of Liberty should henceforth be represented by a "tincup" if this bill was enacted. His analogy is completely inaccurate. To portray the financial relationship between New York State and the Federal Government, it would be more appropriate to replace the torch with a check book and a fountain pen. We have been paying Uncle Sam's bills for activities which do not benefit New York for years.

In 1959, for example, 8.3 percent of the Federal taxes paid by New Yorkers were returned to New York State in the form of Federal payments to State and local governments. The gentleman who made the "tincup" statement comes from a State which received twice as much, 15.2 percent. In 1959 Wyoming received 32.3 percent, New Mexico 27.3 percent, and the only State with a percentage lower than that of New York was New Jersey, with 6.4 percent. We do not hold a "tincup." We never have. It is about time New York State got a fair shake from the Federal Government, and that is all we ask.

Consider the contingents which descended on New York City in September and October of 1960—Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, Castro, and Kadar. This was shortly after the U-2 and RB-47 incidents. Relations were strained. The temperature of the cold war was rising steadily. The job of protecting these "two-bit" dictators, many people believed, was impossible. Nevertheless, the police force of New York City did the job and did it well. We owe them a real debt of gratitude, for an incident during those visits might have been catastrophic. The amount requested in the legislation which has passed the House and which I have introduced in the Senate is reasonable and fair. I urge the Senate to give its immediate attention and favorable action.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1962:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Justice M. Chambers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Edward A. McDermott.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. (New position.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Jaimes O. Brown	William B. Durham
James Cavahaugh	Hamlett I. Allen
Rodman W. Vaughan	Theron H. Gato
Arnold J. Larsen	Charles F. W. Cullison
Frederick B. Thatcher	

The following-named person to be lieutenant commander in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Alvin J. Boxwell

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Harry Andrew Allen
John Knight Andrews
George Eddings Archer, Jr.
William Leon Avery
Albert Frank Baker
Clifford Eugene Banner
Robert Andrew Bastek
Peter Michael Bernstein
Raymond Demetrius Bland
Richard Carl Blaschke
Robert Kent Blaschke
Thomas Walter Boerger
Harold Lance Bonnet
William Andrew Borchers
David Thomas Boyle
Robert Frederick Boysen, Jr.
John Wentworth Brittain
Larry Dennis Brooks
Phillip Jeffrey Bull
Carl Henry Burkhardt
David Kevin Carey
Louis Michael Casale
George Anthony Casimir
David Raynor Coady
Walter Melbourne Coburn
Richard Vincent Consigli
Joseph Lawrence Crowe, Jr.
Laurence Joseph Dallaire, Jr.
John George Denninger, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Dibella
Joseph Henry Disenza
Lance Arthur Eagan
Joseph Robert Finelli
Arthur Richard Gandt
David Shaw Gemmell
James Franklin Greene, Jr.
Richmond Dean Greenough, Jr.
William Scott Haight
Glenn Edgar Haines
David Wade Hastings
William Colbert Heming
Arthur Eugene Henn
Peter Christian Hennings
Stephen Henry Hines
Eugene Hornstein
Raymond Jerry Houttekier
Kwang-Ping Hsu
Norman Henry Huff
Herbert Miller Hurst
Harry Nelson Hutchins III
Thomas Patrick Keane
Don Michael Keehn
Thomas Joseph Kenney
Frederick Arthur Kelley
Richard Joseph Kiesel
Daniel Tobias Koenig
James Henry Lightner
Thomas Henry Lloyd, Jr.
Neal Mahan

Robert David Markoff
George Edward Mason
John Thomas Mason
John Michael McCann
Robert Edward McDonough, Jr.
James Charles McElroy
Thomas Peter McGann
Thomas Francis McGrath III
James Andrew McIntosh
Alexander Clark McKean, Jr.
Timothy George McKinna
Arthur William Mergner, Jr.
Wade Mulford Moncrief, Jr.
Francis William Mooney
Charles Wesley Morgan
Stewart Brandhorst Morgan
James Lowell Mueller
William Stewart Murray
Michael Owen Murtagh
Peter Thomas Muth
Richard Brien O'Keefe
Leonard Joseph Pichini
Ronald Martin Potter
David William Proudfoot
David William Robinette
Edward Kenneth Roe, Jr.
Allen Edward Rolland
William Henry Roth
Jon Patrick Ryan
Joseph Henry Sanford
Lawrence Michael Schilling
Michael Joseph Schiro
John Callup Schmidtman
Richard Eugene Shrum
Frederick Damien Smith
Joseph James Smith
Thomas David Smith
Anthony John Soltys
Theodore Arthur Somes
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
William Harry Spence
Wayne Paul Stevens
Hugh Lafayette Thomas, Jr.
Henry Bradley Traver
James Alexander Umberger
Joseph Louis Valenti
Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.
James Lee Walker
William James Wallace, Jr.
Thomas William Watkins III
Thomas Samuel Whipple
Daniel Michael White
Jack Warwick Whiting, Jr.
David Hart Whitten
David Harold Withers
John Anthony Wuestneck
Ronald Charles Zinzer

The following-named person to be chief warrant officer, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Joseph A. Nartonis

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officer, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard D. Borden
Marlan H. Murphy
Louis DeBernardi, Jr.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John F. Archer, of California.
Richard C. Barkley, of Michigan.
Robert L. Barry, of Pennsylvania.
Natale H. Bellocchi, of New York.
Norman M. Bouton, of Indiana.

A. Donald Bramante, of Virginia.
John R. Countryman, of New York.
Miss Marie R. de Gunzburg, of New York.
Eugene Klebenov, of Massachusetts.
James E. Leader, of Delaware.
William K. Mackey, of the District of Columbia.

Andrew J. Pierre, of New York.
Gilbert F. Rankin, of California.
Frederick S. Vaznaugh, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Michael J. Barry, of New York.
William W. Beyer, of New Jersey.
Richard A. Christensen, of Wisconsin.
John R. Davis, of New York.
Peter Jon de Vos, of the District of Columbia.

Charles F. Dunbar, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Henry A. Engelbrecht, Jr., of Maryland.
Ronald D. Flack, of Minnesota.
Carmen L. Gentile, of Massachusetts.
John L. Gibson, of Iowa.

Miss Dixie L. Harrington, of Iowa.
Miss Ruth M. Held, of New York.
M. Charles Hill, of New Jersey.
Miss Carolyn M. Kruschke, of Minnesota.
Edward A. Mainland, of California.
Paul M. Meo, of Massachusetts.
Robert P. Myers, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. T. Niles, of Kentucky.
Ernest D. Oates, of California.
Arthur M. Odum, of Texas.
Walter E. Stadler, of New York.
Carl Taylor, of Vermont.
Joel D. Ticknor, of New York.
Thaddeus C. Trzyna, of California.
Frank Tumminia, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington.
John H. Backer, of North Carolina.
James P. Burke, of Maryland.
James D. Conley, of Indiana.
Robert M. Gilkey, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Benjamin H. Jackson, Jr., of Rhode Island.
William A. K. Jones, of the District of Columbia.

Barry R. Nemcoff, of Pennsylvania.
Robert L. Nichols, of New Hampshire.
Ralph G. Seehafer, of Virginia.
Laurence Sharpe, of Illinois.
Robert B. Warner, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

James E. Bradshaw, of Tennessee.
Earl Monroe Dennis, Jr., of Virginia.
Arthur P. Frizzell, of Maine.
Thomas J. Gunning, of Wisconsin.
C. Clark Rumrill, of New York.

Creed Davis Tucker, of Illinois.
Arthur M. Niner, Jr., of New Jersey, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David H. Blee, of California.
Charles O. Coudert, of Connecticut.
Charles B. Fahs, of New Jersey.
John P. Horgan, of Virginia.
Lloyd L. Lee, of Hawaii.
Alan D. Wolfe, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

William C. Kirk, Jr., of Florida.
Frederick W. Shaffer, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Corinne W. Spencer, of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 2: 5: Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.

Almighty God, may this moment, set aside for prayer, be one of high and holy communion when in fellowship with one another we are brought, by Thy spirit, under the sovereignty of the mind of Christ, His humility and obedience, His purity and peace.

We acknowledge sorrowfully that we are living in a world where many are distressed and disappointed, turning their eyes upon the ground whence no help can come rather than heavenward and unto Thee in whom all the perplexing questions and lofty aspirations of our hearts find their answer.

Grant that in response to the winsome overtures and persuasions of our divine Lord we may open widely the windows of our minds to the truth that sets us free and the love that never fails but makes us equal to all the demands of our day and generation.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 5, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2768. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE SHAHANSHAH OF IRAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, April 12, 1962, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting his Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee

on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the military construction bill H.R. 11131.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 15th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The White House, April 9, 1962.

HOW TO CHOKE OFF A RECOVERY: THE FEDERAL RESERVE DOES IT AGAIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the recovery from the 1960 recession, promising until a few months ago, shows serious signs of petering out.

The administration has predicted a balanced budget for fiscal 1963 based upon revenues from a projected gross national product for the calendar year 1962 of \$570 billion. But now, according to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, gross national product for the first half of 1962 is not meeting expectations. Thus, tax revenues will be below those expected, and the precariously balanced budget will be out of balance. Colin Stam, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, has already estimated a fiscal 1963 budget deficit on the order of \$4 billion.

Unemployment, too, has not been reduced as fast as hoped. It now looks as if we would not be able to reach our modest goal of a 4-percent unemployment rate until the second half of 1963, if then. While the present unemployment rate of 5.5 percent is below peak recession levels, a long-term unemployment has just recently begun to increase again.

The rate of nonfarm housing starts, seasonally adjusted, has steadily declined every month from October 1961.

Consumer purchasing has not expanded at the rate hoped for by Government economists.

While our international payments situation has been improving, the progress made can well be frustrated by our lagging recovery rate. Foreign central bankers are particularly sensitive to an unbalanced budget in the United States—

even though they are used to looking the other way when their own budgets do not balance. If we want to keep the confidence of Europe's central bankers, we must do the best job we know how to attain the adequate growth rate which alone can bring about a balanced budget.

What is causing the trouble? What is the reason our recovery is slowing down?

The biggest single reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Reserve System is up to its old tricks.

Twice before in the last 8 years, the Federal Reserve System has applied the brakes before the economy, emerging from a recession, had a chance to get rolling again. As a result millions of man-hours were lost through unemployment; vast plant capacity went unused; and our growth rate staggered and broke, rather than turned upward.

In the 1954 recession the Federal Reserve System, very properly, made available to the banking system net free reserves on the order of \$500 million. By 1955, with the country emerging from a recession, the Fed decided to apply the brakes. Net free reserves—the true unused lending capacity of the banking system—were lowered to around \$300 million, and later, in 1956 and 1957, the banking system was actually placed in a net borrowed position.

By 1958 we had another serious recession, and the Fed—locking the stable after the horse was stolen—then raised net free reserves again to \$500 million. But by the autumn of 1958 recovery had started. So the Federal Reserve promptly lowered its net free reserves so that 1958 saw the banks once again in a net borrowed position.

I do not wish to seem a partisan in my criticism of the Federal Reserve System for choking off recovery from the 1958 recession. Let us take a look at what two prominent Republican economists had to say about the Fed's performance.

W. Allen Wallis, dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago, was Vice Chairman of President Eisenhower's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. In a speech last May, Mr. Wallis said:

The Federal Reserve Board tightened up the money supply in 1959 overvigorously and overpromptly as a move against inflation. But the inflation wasn't there.

Arthur Burns was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under the Eisenhower administration. Last April, Mr. Burns, taking a backward look at the Fed's monetary performance, accused the Federal Reserve of choking off business recovery in 1959 by tightening credit with excessive vigor.

On June 1 and 2, 1961, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, was conducting its annual review of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was before the Committee. I congratulated Mr. Martin and the Federal Reserve System for helping to combat the recession of 1960 by maintaining net free reserves, as it had done for the first half of 1961,

at the level of \$500 million. And then I said:

I would like to express the hope that the Federal Reserve from here on out will keep its free net reserves in the banking system at something like the present level of half a billion until we get the unemployment rate down, not to 6 percent, not to 5 percent, but to some lower percentage, call it 4, if you like, which will enable the economy to grow, and us to make a dent in unemployment (hearings, p. 100).

Chairman Martin replied:

Well, I appreciate your comments, Mr. Reuss, and I want to say that the Federal Reserve deplores the unemployment situation just as much as you do, and is just as anxious as you are to lower it.

I cannot forecast what the future policy of the Open Market Committee will be, but I will certainly bear in mind your comments, and I am sure that all the members of the Open Market Committee will be very glad to have your observations. But I am absolutely convinced that, in the overall picture, artificially cheap money would not contribute to reducing the unemployment picture.

To which I replied:

I am not for artificially cheap money, but just for the kind of money you are now producing, and should keep on producing until unemployment is down to a manageable level.

Much to my delight, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve System then proceeded to keep free reserves at around the \$500 million level for the months following that June 1, 1961, colloquy. Free reserves, at the \$549 million level in June, were still at the \$517 million level in November. The recovery continued nicely.

Practically all through 1961, the Fed Open Market Committee, which—by buying or selling securities in the open market—controls the level of reserves of the banking system and thus the money supply, pursued this adequate-money policy. As the minutes of the Open Market Committee meeting every 3 weeks show it wisely decided to let well enough alone through June and July and August and September and October and November 1961.

But, alas, this performance was too good to be true. On December 19, 1961, the Fed returned to its old habit of choking off recovery, learned in 1955 and 1959. The Open Market Committee issued an economic policy directive for a somewhat slower rate of increase in total reserves than during recent months, and with emphasis on continuance of the 3-month Treasury bill rate at close to the top of the range recently prevailing.

To their credit, Govs. G. H. King, Jr., and George W. Mitchell voted against the directive on the grounds that the time had not yet arrived for any modification of policy in the direction of less ease.

The new tight-money policy was soon in taking effect.

The 90-day Treasury bill rate, which was at 2.4 percent in November 1961, promptly jumped up to 2.75 percent, where it has since remained.

The money supply, which had been increasing steadily throughout 1961 and had reached a peak of \$144.9 billion in December 1961, declined in January and February 1962. In the second half of February, the last date for which we

have figures, money supply had dropped to \$144.2 billion, a decrease from December of \$700 million.

Free reserves likewise felt the onslaught of the new tight-money policy. By February 1962, they had dropped to \$424 million. They rebounded slightly to \$444 million by February 14, and have been lower ever since. Free reserves were \$350 million on March 8, \$353 million on March 22, and \$369 million on March 28, 1962. This low level of free reserves means that great numbers of banks, particularly city banks, are "loaned up"—without any ability to lend money, except as an old loan is paid off, or as securities from their portfolios are sold. Indeed, in February, commercial banks had to sell \$1.2 billion of U.S. securities, at least partly in order to meet even a small part of the demands of businessmen, homebuilders, consumers, and other loan applicants.

Now, it is perfectly true that in the last few weeks the interest rate on long-term U.S. bonds, and on other long-term securities, has softened slightly. This softening, however, has been in spite of, not because of, Federal Reserve monetary policy. Investors have become somewhat more pessimistic about the economy's growth rate, and are hence switching from stocks to bonds, which raises bond prices and lowers bond yields.

The Federal Reserve System, I regret to say, is at it again. Having tasted the heady wine of tight money when the economy was recovering in 1955 and 1959, it has now reached for the same old bottle again just as the economy was beginning to recover.

The remedy is clear. The Federal Reserve System ought promptly to repeal its destructive policy decision of December 16, 1961, and supply the economy with adequate credit—net free reserves at least at the \$500 million level. Two bouts with the tight-money bottle in a decade are enough.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me the answer to a question that has been troubling me for some time: Why the \$50 million that was used to buy 245 million French francs on March 1 of this year did not come out of the International Monetary Fund rather than out of funds controlled by the Federal Reserve System? Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. REUSS. I think I can explain the Federal Reserve System's position in that. The International Monetary Fund does not buy and sell foreign currency for the account of any one of its member countries. If a member country wants to acquire foreign currencies for its own purpose, it has to buy these itself. The Treasury of the United States since 1933, pursuant to the Treasury Stabilization Fund that has been set up for that purpose, does, therefore, deal in foreign currencies. As far as I am concerned, this is a salutary function. The Federal Reserve got into this business only recently.

It will interest the gentleman from Iowa that I and other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency expressed a good deal of interest in just what the Federal Reserve was doing when Mr. Martin appeared before us within the last month. We wanted to be very sure, and I know the gentleman from Iowa will agree with our philosophy there, that Congress retain some knowledge of and control over what the executive departments were doing. As the result of that inquiry we wrote into the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the payments legislation that was before this body last week a very definite requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury, the politically responsible officer in this country, charge himself with the responsibility of setting and formulating our international economic and financial policy with particular regard to this matter of buying foreign currencies, so that the Congress would have one place to look to and so that uncoordinated activities could not go on.

In specific answer to the gentleman's question about the \$50 million purchase in French francs which was made just a few weeks ago, I think that that purchase probably was in the national interest. I think that is so because 3 or 4 weeks ago turned out to be a time when the franc was purchasable at a fair exchange rate. I think it is well to have in our kitty some foreign currency so that if the dollar should once again be placed under strain we can do what we can to bail it out.

However, and now I come to what I think is the more appropriate answer to the gentleman's question, the primary duty of helping maintain the dollar as an international reserve key currency is and should be on the International Monetary Fund. It is significant that in the past this country, the United States, has been a very generous participant in the International Monetary Fund. Now that the dollar itself has international problems, it is only meet, right, and proper that the International Monetary Fund help us more than it has in the past. The purpose of the payments agreement which was passed by this body last week was to impose that kind of obligation on the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. GROSS. Let me get this straight. Is it possible to use the funds from the International Monetary Fund for the purpose of buying other countries' currencies in order to defend the position of or stabilize the dollar in the international money market?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, it is. Technically this is true right now. However, the purpose of the payments agreement legislation which went through this body last week was to get additional funds into the International Monetary Fund. The unhappy truth is that today the Fund holds only negligible quantities of French francs, Italian lira, West German deutschemarks, and other very strong continental currencies. Under the agreement which this body of the Congress ratified, the International Monetary Fund would put itself in a position where it may lay its hands on \$3 billion

worth of these key continental currencies, leaving aside pounds sterling and of course our own currency, the dollar. When that is done, and I hope it is done quickly, then it will be true that this country can avail itself of the offices of the International Monetary Fund to get its hands on currencies like French francs.

When that happens, I would hope that we would use the International Monetary Fund for that purpose, and not feel it so necessary to buy these currencies ourselves out of our own dollar stabilization fund.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, with the Federal Reserve using \$50 million as it did on March 1 of this year to buy French francs; is that not contributing to and widening the imbalance of our dollar transactions rather than helping?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman's Midwestern horseshoe arithmetic is very good as usual. This is a criticism I have of infinite activities by either the Treasury or the Federal Reserve to buy foreign currency. In a sense it is bootstrap lifting, because we have to buy the foreign currency with dollars. In defense of our money experts, I would say this:

There are times when in a particular week the dollar looks strong and the franc looks relatively weak and when it may make sense to get a few of these foreign currencies into our kitty. But I think the gentleman is on essentially sound ground when he says, you cannot lift yourself by your own bootstraps, if you spend \$50 million to buy francs, you are \$50 million shy on your balance of payments to the extent that you have done that. I think the gentleman, by the same token, would agree that this technical operation, if conducted by competent people who know what they are doing, can moderately help us in the central problem that we are confronted with, which is, as the gentleman, I am sure, would agree, getting and keeping a sound full-employment economy at home, and bringing our international payments into balance, and then seeing that raids and runs on the dollar are warded off by the kind of international cooperative action which does not place all the burden on Uncle Sam. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I certainly do. I am pleased to hear the gentleman state that, after all, it comes back to the integrity of the dollar, and that we can best maintain the integrity of the dollar by taking care of our finances reasonably and logically with balanced budgets in this country. It seems to me that this is where we must maintain the integrity of the dollar—here at home. I want to say to the gentleman, I did read the hearings, with a great deal of interest, and particularly the questions which the gentleman from Wisconsin asked of Mr. Martin as well as Mr. Dillon on the subject—and, perhaps, I stated it wrongly—of the divided authority to use our money in an attempt to stabilize the dollar in the international money market. I agree completely with the gentleman that this ought to be concentrated in one

place so that we will know precisely what we are doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. I do not think the gentleman misstated matters when he referred to the divided authority. That is the way the situation has developed. I think the Congress by timely action made clear its desire to have that authority concentrated.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an issue which President Kennedy dealt with in his message on transportation delivered to the Congress recently. I refer to one of the most urgent and important domestic issues facing the Nation, namely, that of urban transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Commerce have recently undertaken field investigations of the problems of urban transportation. Their findings support the need for substantial expansion and significant changes in the urban mass transportation program authorized in the Housing Act of 1961.

Based on these studies, the President, in his message on transportation, has urged the Congress to provide Federal financial aid and technical assistance to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vital to the great majority of our citizens. I join with President Kennedy in urging your support of such a viable Federal program which has such an important bearing on the future financial and economic well-being of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the problem of traffic congestion in our great metropolitan areas—the great urban centers of our Nation which are, at once, home for three-quarters of our population, the centers of our culture, research, and education, the headquarters for our great corporate endeavors, and the wellspring of our Nation's wealth.

It is ironic in an era in which we are making stirring advances in space transportation that the problem of ground transportation in Metropolis, U.S.A., lies festering and unattended. Colonel Glenn traveled halfway around the earth last February 20 in less time than it takes millions of our workers to travel from their homes to their jobs.

We can look forward confidently to still greater advances in space transportation. But our prospects of unsnarling the traffic jams on our metropolitan highways and freeways are dismal unless this Congress provides the same kind of leadership and assistance that put our Nation's space program into orbit in a period of only a few short years.

A variety of factors have contributed to the congestion problems now facing our urban centers, three of which seem to stand out as particularly important. First is the great population explosion

the United States has experienced in the past 20 years. But even more significant than the overall increase in the number of people is the fact that the bulk of population growth is occurring in our metropolitan areas, particularly in the outlying regions of these areas. Half of our urbanites now live in "Suburbia" compared to 1 in 3 in 1950. This rapid expansion of metropolitan fringe areas has greatly increased the strain on the transportation facilities of our great urban centers and is threatening the fiscal solvency and economic survival of core cities.

Second, Federal housing activities and programs have accentuated this dispersal process. In particular, Federal home loan guarantee programs have promoted single family home ownership in suburban areas at the expense of the central cities. The growing scarcity of urban land has pushed these suburban housing developments further and further away from the economic employment hubs of our metropolitan regions. The lack of Federal programs to encourage the provision of suitable housing alternatives in downtown locations for middle income families has given additional impetus to the exodus of many city families. As a result a distressing number of older cities are becoming ghettos of low income and minority families, the tax base of these cities has become seriously eroded and urban transportation problems multiplied.

Last, the Federal highway air program by encouraging ownership of private automobiles has contributed to the decline in public transportation facilities. It is now increasingly evident in most cities that facilities for both private and public transportation are needed if traffic congestion downtown is not to stifle our urban centers. Traffic jams in our city streets are now costing the Nation some \$5 billion each year in lower downtown commercial sales, lower tax revenues, lost time and wages, extra fuel consumption, and faster vehicle deterioration.

All these problems are accentuated in my home State of California, which will become the most populous State in the Nation before the end of this year.

The problem of traffic congestion in California centers in the two great metropolitan regions of San Francisco and Los Angeles, which account for nearly three-quarters of the State's total population and for some \$21 billion of the State's total assessed valuation of \$29 billion.

In a very real sense, California's economic future is highly dependent upon the economic vitality of San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas. And the economic health of California is, of course, of direct concern to the Federal Government in many important ways.

Thus, the traffic congestion—particularly the morning and evening peak hour congestion—which today threatens to strangle the economy of these regions should be a source of great concern to all of us.

We have not been idle, I can assure you, in our efforts to cope with these

problems. Next to education, California annually spends more on highways and freeways than for any other purpose. This State money combined with Federal aid highway grants have enabled California to develop what is generally acknowledged to be the finest freeway and highway system in the world. And we are continuing this program with all vigor.

But despite our herculean efforts and enormous outlays of Federal and State money, we are unable to keep up with the mounting population of people and cars. We long ago came to the conclusion that facilities for the private automobile alone are not enough, and that our highways and streets must be augmented and complemented by superior rapid transit systems.

We are so convinced, in fact, that our metropolitan freeway plans have been based on the assumption that rapid transit systems will be operating in the San Francisco Bay area and the Los Angeles area by 1980.

Both of these great metropolitan regions have made great progress toward building rapid transit systems. In the case of the San Francisco Bay area, a step-by-step program designed to produce the most modern rapid transit system in the world has been underway for more than 10 years.

It has been a decade of pioneering work. The plans which have been developed by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District have won acclaim from transportation experts throughout the world. For, in essence, these plans provide the first public transportation system ever developed which is able to provide transportation superior to the private automobile and to serve the entire metropolitan region.

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that these plans will be presented to the voters in the San Francisco Bay area at the general election this coming November. It is this schedule which lends a great urgency to our consideration of aid for metropolitan mass transit systems.

Mr. Speaker, transportation authorities throughout the country concede that the fate of rapid transit plans in the bay area could well determine the future of rapid transit planning in other metropolitan areas. If the bay area plans succeed, that success could well mean an immediate renaissance in public transportation everywhere. If these plans fail, efforts to develop new and improved public transportation systems could be set back immeasurably.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the success or failure of the rapid transit plans for the San Francisco Bay area becomes a national issue of great importance.

The issue in the bay area will be decided squarely on a basis of money. The people of the bay area, time after time, have indicated their desire for a rapid transit system to work with their freeways. The question remaining is whether they will be willing to cast a 60 percent majority vote in favor of increasing their property taxes to pay the estimated \$790 million cost of the proposed system. As you can well realize, Mr. Speaker, obtaining the required 60 percent majority on an issue of such ma-

ior proportions will be a most difficult problem.

If prior to the time the issue comes to a vote this Congress has taken meaningful action to make available the same type of financial aid which it already is making available for highways, urban renewal, and other major problems, I am sure that the chances of passing the bond issue will be increased tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the November vote in the bay area could well be a test case nationally for rapid transit. Therefore, I believe, it behooves this Congress to hasten its consideration of transit aid legislation and do everything in its power to insure the success of the San Francisco system.

I also urge this Congress to formulate a national policy for a coordinated and balanced transportation system. If we can do this, Mr. Speaker, I believe future historians will record our action among the most important accomplishments of the 87th session. Only by combining the efforts of all levels of government and promoting more comprehensive metropolitan area planning in the field of urban transportation can we solve this urgent problem of 20th-century urban America.

STOCKPILING OF U.S. FOREIGN AID FUNDS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, from the recapitulation provided by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the recent report filed by the Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Program, it is rather obvious that the State Department and the recipients of U.S. generosity are stockpiling our foreign aid funds.

According to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana—and he should know; he is chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee—there is approximately \$10 billion available in foreign aid funds for obligation and expenditure for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. This is not all the foreign aid available by any manner of means; yet the administration is asking for another \$4.9 billion for fiscal 1963.

All of these funds will not be disbursed during 1962, leaving an enormous sum available for later distribution.

Our foreign aid program is directly related to our balance-of-payments deficit; and, unless the outflow of gold and dollars to foreign nations is drastically reduced, our generosity could wreck our own economy.

This survey team of the Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Program recently sent to Korea, Vietnam, and Turkey reported stockpiling procedures of foreign aid funds in those countries.

The mission of this team was to search for evidence of waste as well as failure to accomplish anticipated results.

Many deficiencies observed by this team were not made public because the Executive classified them as secret for fear of giving undesirable information to our enemies or for fear public exposure of them would jeopardize our relations with friendly governments.

Although the survey team did not review every obligation of funds it found many that were carried over from year to year, some as much as 5 years, when they were not utilized as scheduled. The survey team reported that these actions had the effect of stockpiling funds on the chance that they might ultimately be used.

The survey team stated in their findings that 5 years have now passed since the signing of the original project agreement for a dam in Korea and little of a tangible nature has been accomplished. Funds have been obligated in the amount of \$6 million, only \$15,000 has been liquidated and a balance of \$5,985,000 is still being held.

Another project involving \$9.7 million obligated since 1958 is being held in abeyance while local officials make up their minds what to do.

The subcommittee reported that the United States should not go ahead with financing a plant until responsible officials are sure what they want done. The holding of several million dollars to finance construction for a period of years while officials make up their minds does not appear to be justified, however. And with this, I concur.

The report indicated that some \$10 million was being held for future highway use without a precise program or specific commitments for its use in Vietnam. Here again it appears that funds are being stockpiled for future but undetermined uses.

The subcommittee report stated that the survey team discovered in Turkey, expired procurement authorizations with large uncontracted balances being retained as valid obligations. One such instance was a procurement authorization for construction, mining, conveying equipment, and parts. It has \$71,000 uncontracted at June 30, 1961, which should have been deobligated and returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Another reported instance was a procurement authorization for fertilizer in the original amount of \$2.5 million. Of this sum \$1,290,263 was being held as a valid obligation although it was uncontracted and the contracting and delivery dates had expired.

All of which indicated that little if any control or check is made by the United States of these authorizations after they have been once issued. Add these disclosures to what is being withheld from the public and you have an unconscionable situation as far as the taxpayer is concerned.

These revelations by such a cursory examination or inquiry indicate that in all probability there are vast hidden reserves available in all countries receiving our aid and that they are being stockpiled for future use.

All of which points up the fact that a much needed reappraisal of our foreign aid program is long overdue. Unless we call a halt to this stockpiling of foreign aid funds and put some rigid controls on our generosity, we are soon going to find the dollar valueless.

We have to stop taking care of the rest of the world and put our own affairs in order.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the two bills which I am introducing today have been recommended by the President for the purpose of expanding and improving the recreational resources of this Nation.

The first of these measures is a bill to provide for the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to States for outdoor recreation planning. This legislation is based on an extensive and thorough study by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which emphasized the fact that good outdoor recreational opportunities for all Americans depend on an effectively planned, well coordinated effort on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and private citizens. In addition to legislative action, the President's executive order creating an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council, and the Interior Secretary's establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within that Department will be of great assistance in carrying out the recommendations of the Commission.

This proposed bill will confer on the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation the appropriate authority to make a national recreation program effective. Also, it would authorize \$50 million in grants over a 7-year period to help the States plan well-rounded outdoor recreation programs.

Some of the functions assigned to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would be the encouragement of the program itself, the maintenance of a continuing inventory of outdoor recreation resources and needs, the administration of State assistance and the encouragement of interstate cooperation, the carrying on of research and the publication of information, the preparation of a nationwide recreational program, the establishment of educational programs to make the people of our country aware of the advantages of outdoor recreation, and the promotion of cooperation with other agencies in carrying out the program.

While the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended funds for planning, land acqui-

sition, and loans to help States to meet the matching payments, the bill I am introducing suggests only planning grants at this time. After the various studies have been made, we can better evaluate our remaining needs in this area.

If this measure is enacted, the type of program envisioned by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission can become a reality.

The second measure I am introducing—a bill to establish a land conservation fund—is intended to complement the first measure.

There is need for a fiscally responsible means of financing the eventual acquisition of land for outdoor recreational purposes. This bill establishes or authorizes the needed new revenue sources. These sources include:

First. Proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees on Federal land and water areas.

Second. Proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus nonmilitary real property.

Third. That portion of the gasoline excise tax for gasoline used in boats which is now refundable under existing law.

Fourth. Revenues from a new system of annual Federal user charges on recreation boats.

A portion of the revenues realized from these sources would be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury to help offset the costs of acquiring additional lands for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at Federal reservoirs, financed through project appropriations to water resources agencies. The remaining revenues will be transferred to the land conservation fund established by the bill. The legislation also includes advance appropriations of \$500 million so that the program can be begun without delay. The money will be repaid from the sources mentioned. Other recommendations made by the President in his transmittal letter accompanying the draft bill are likewise included.

The importance and urgency of these two measures dictate that they be acted upon without delay. The health and happiness of our Nation can be enhanced by the expansion and development of America's outdoor recreational advantages.

A SCHOOL FOR FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, I commented on an important health problem that our Nation is facing: The care and training of the forgotten child, the more than 10,000 mentally retarded youngsters who are in need of special care.

It is one of the unfortunate facts of life that we frequently forget those in

our midst who are not adequately endowed, because of the accidents of birth, to cope with their environment and provide for themselves. There are those who care, however, and the Institute for Retarded Children of the Shield of David is composed of people who care and who are working constantly to help the mentally handicapped and to find the causes and cure of mental retardation.

In connection with their efforts I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article "School for Forgotten Children," which appeared in Today's Health for July 1961:

A SCHOOL FOR FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

(By William R. Vath)

Donny was 8½ the day his parents took him on his first ride in a taxi. Quiet and withdrawn, but quick to smile, the tow-headed youngster seemed a little bewildered as the cab pulled up in front of its destination at 1800 Andrews Avenue. He'd never been this far from home before, and the ride through Manhattan was a new and different experience for him.

The third son of a \$90-a-week hardware store clerk, Donny had never been farther away from home before than the supermarket on the corner. And that had only been three or four times when his mother couldn't find someone to watch him. He'd never been to school, either—though both his older brothers had started in first grade when they were 6.

But these things didn't bother Donny. Nor did the fact that he hadn't learned to speak more than a dozen or so words. He did have one reason to be proud, however: he was toilet trained, had been now for almost a year. But Donny felt no pride. Nor did he know or feel hardly any of the emotions of an 8½-year-old boy.

For Donny was mentally retarded. Diagnosis: congenital cerebral defect.

His mother and father knew those words well, and what they represented, though they understood nothing of how this defect came about or why it had to be Donny who was born this way.

Ever since their family doctor had suggested, when Donny was barely a year old, that they put him somewhere he could get special training, the parents had looked for that "somewhere" they could afford on a budget of \$90 a week. They couldn't bring themselves to apply for a place in a State school—their consciences would never let them do that.

So Donny stayed at home, while his family endured the pain, the confusion, the frustrations of every parent of a mentally retarded child—and, most of all, the feelings of guilt that they weren't doing something for him. Now it was getting worse; the other boys were growing up and Donny was becoming a burden for them too.

Then the parents heard about the Shield of David Institute for Retarded Children. They heard that here a family could pay as little as \$1 a month for special schooling, speech therapy, tests, individual psychotherapy, and counseling services.

Of all the tragedies of parenthood, one is perhaps most stark and painful: The day a mother and father learn that their child is mentally retarded. For of the multitude of human ailments, none is more beclouded with mystery nor so complicated in its origin and range of diagnostic categories.

A classification of these various categories in the Journal of the American Association of Mental Deficiency takes 110 pages. Most of the victims fall into categories where very little is understood of the cause of their illness: mongolism, congenital cerebral defects, and those whose causes aren't even classified.

To most stricken children today, mental retardation is a lifetime handicap. Except

in certain disorders, and providing diagnosis comes early enough, medical science with its present knowledge cannot hold out hope for a cure—only help in training and educating.

To the parents of a severely afflicted child, it means confusion and frustration as they seek aid in trying to do something for the youngster. It means an unending struggle to educate the child in the simplest of tasks—speaking intelligible words, dressing himself, toilet training.

And retardation often means a double tragedy, for multiple handicaps are frequent—bones and muscles that are warped and useless, eyes that don't see properly, ears that don't hear as they should, emotional problems.

And even when they come to realize that only the skill and guidance of professional personnel can help their child, the average parents have trouble finding facilities within their financial means. Training becomes unattainable.

It was to help fill this desperate need that the Shield of David was organized in New York City in 1954. A nonsectarian organization (65 percent of patients are Christian, 35 percent Jewish), it has effectively combined a day school for the training of severely retarded children with a social work guidance program for parents.

Donny's parents were welcomed that first morning by the institute's clinic director, Dr. Joseph Michaels, who introduced them to the school psychologist, a social worker, and a pediatrician. During a long interview, these staff members asked many questions about Donny and conditions at home, and answered many of the parents' questions about the institute.

They explained that the institute's services are divided among three specific areas:

1. For parents of children from birth to 4 years, a home training program, along with parental guidance and casework service.
2. For children from 4 to 7, a daily school training program in an effort to help these youngsters become eligible for special classes of the public schools.
3. For children from 4 to 12, a school-training program geared to their intellectual level and with a view to helping them become ready for public school or other facilities. Donny would be included in this third category.

Of the institute's current active registration of 158 children from all economic groups and all sections of the metropolitan area of New York, 96 attend a part-time day school. Operating 5 days a week from 9 to 5, September through June, the school has 2-hour sessions either in the morning or the afternoon for most of its students. There are also 2 groups of about 15 children who attend a full-day program.

About half of those attending the school are picked up and delivered by chartered buses; the others provide their own transportation or live close enough to walk to school.

The 62 children enrolled in the home-training program (infants to age 4) are visited 1 day each week by either a public health nurse or a teacher.

Donny's parents learned that fees at Shield of David are determined after interviews with a social worker assigned to the case, and depend upon the family's income, size of family, and special expenses involved. At the institute, there are usually 12 to 15 families on the department of welfare rolls. These cases pay the minimum fee of \$1 monthly, which is subsidized by the department of welfare. Another 10 percent of the cases pay the maximum fee of \$50 a month. The remaining 80 percent pays between \$1 and \$15 a month. An initial diagnostic fee is charged for all patients; it ranges from \$5 to \$15, depending on individual circumstances.

Parents' fees supply only 8½ percent of the institute's \$200,000-plus annual budget. The

remainder comes from membership auxiliaries (about 25 percent), the National Institute of Mental Health (about 25 percent), contributing organizations (about 10 percent), and other miscellaneous sources.

The real heart of the entire program, the staff psychologist explained, is the service to parents in helping them understand the child's condition, the daily areas of conflict and stress which parents experience, and the problems of the relationship of the retarded child to other members of the family.

Ready to assist in this demanding task is a professional staff of 34, including a psychiatrist, a pediatrician, an ophthalmologist, a dental consultant, 3 psychologists, a public health nurse, a speech pathologist, 4 speech therapists, a casework supervisor, 4 psychiatric social workers, an educational director, an educational consultant, 11 teachers, a student teacher, and 2 social work students.

After the interview with Donny's parents, the pediatrician took Donny to the diagnostic clinic for a physical examination and psychiatric testing. Diagnosis is complex and difficult; normal psychological tools do not exist for testing retarded children since the normal rules of psychology do not apply to them. Thus, no diagnosis is attempted the first day. Donny's parents learned that this would be decided later at a staff diagnostic and treatment conference, where each case is comprehensively evaluated.

The clinic staff has seen, over the years, the whole range of known and determinable factors in retardation, including those caused by prenatal or postnatal infections, trauma, and metabolic disorders. Among the multiple handicaps they've tried to help have been impairment of sight and hearing, convulsive disorders (including all forms of epilepsy), psychiatric impairment (i.e., emotional and behavioral disorders), motor dysfunction (including all forms of paralysis and unusual muscle movement).

For the past year and a half, the institute has provided full dental care for most of its patients, since care for youngsters with some special conditions is not readily available in the community. For a standard fee of \$60 per child, the program includes a complete examination of the teeth and oral cavity and a routine reexamination in 6 months.

Because of the unique nature of the patients for dental work, all rehabilitative treatment is done under anesthesia in a single session. This includes fillings, extractions, and such restorative and rehabilitative procedures as can be accomplished in an office setting. The institute's dental consultant has invented new instruments and devised new procedures specially adapted to work with handicapped and uncooperative patients.

Aside from prescriptions for tranquilizers in some cases, all special or additional medical attention—such as an electroencephalogram, orthopedic aid, and hearing aids—is referred to family physicians. In welfare cases, a report is forwarded to the appropriate treatment clinic.

The staff report merely makes recommendations; it is entirely up to the family physician to use the information the way he sees fit. These reports are, however, followed up through liaison with the personal physicians by caseworkers. Institute policy prohibits staff members from seeing any patients on a private basis.

When Donny was admitted to the school a few weeks later, his parents were cautioned not to expect immediate improvement. It takes 6 to 8 months of observation to form a clinical picture of each patient. In the meantime, individual goals are established for each child, and a program specially suited to him is developed. Youngsters are graduated into classes by their level of functioning—never by age—with about eight children to one teacher.

The overall target is to help each patient develop his maximum capacities. For some, this may mean the ability to speak the simplest words and to respond to simple words and symbols. For others, it may mean fairly rapid graduation into a special low-IQ class in a public school, and then on to occupational training which may eventually enable them to earn their own living.

Patients are grouped according to individual ability and personality and the emotional and training needs of each. Groups vary from passive, withdrawn youngsters to the more aggressive, stimulated, and responsive. Some classes are made up of children with more predominant emotional disturbance or those with pronounced perceptual difficulties.

The 15 patients who attend the full-day school sessions have been introduced to a reading-readiness program and are progressing to more abstract concepts such as letters of the alphabet and color differences.

Donny's teachers were guided by the psychologist's original analysis, and as the weeks went by, the boy was reexamined periodically to detect areas of change and to provide clues for further concentration.

For some children, individual play therapy sessions with a psychologist are recommended to help introduce them to group situations and to drain off excessive aggression that can't be tolerated in a group of classmates.

Donny's mother and father enrolled in one of two group therapy sessions. Meeting in the evening with other parents, they found they could test and reexamine the awareness they had gained through individual counseling and could express and share some of their feelings of isolation and difference from the rest of the world. They met regularly with the teaching staff and participated in educational forums where training procedures were discussed.

From the outset, Donny took part in the school's speech and language program. Children arrive at the clinic with a variety of communication problems: hearing handicaps, difficulty in articulation, echolalia (echoing words and phrases spoken to them), or the almost exclusive use of gestures rather than words. This last was one of Donny's biggest troubles.

In addition to individual sessions with a speech therapist, the boy sat in on group storytelling, choral speaking, and speech games, and learned to work with speech-music materials.

Helping both child and parents adjust to the school is the job of a central member of the clinic team—the caseworker. From the moment Donny was enrolled, she was in frequent contact with the boy's family—asking questions, putting together a general picture of his development and history and his family's social and psychological values, as well as counseling, advising, and answering the many questions this new experience prompted.

Since the casework contact is a condition of the child's attendance in the institute's school, some parents at first strongly resist becoming involved in the service. They feel they've done their part in applying for concrete help, and to them, the school is the fulfillment of that need.

The idea that they, as parents, contribute to their child's development or retardation is an alien concept to some mothers and fathers. They'd prefer to confine the problem to the child's specific condition rather than accept the fact that mental retardation is a family situation which must be met with the personality, strengths, and resources with which any problem in living must be met.

It's the caseworker's job to help the family achieve this maximum mental health as well as to provide the direction and knowledge which parents need to plan for their retarded child. The caseworker interprets

for parents the school staff's general thinking and evaluation of the child's capacity. She also reports to the teaching and clinical staff on conditions in each child's home and changes in parents' attitudes. This enables the staff to know details of the family situation which affect the patient's development and behavior.

Preparing the family for the child's discharge is another important duty of the caseworker. In Donny's case, the school was the first separation of child and family—as it is in many instances—and from the school a more permanent separation will be possible. By the time Donny is ready for discharge, his family will have been helped to a better awareness of his capacity and needs, and they will come to recognize their own emotional problems and attitudes toward Donny. Thus they will be able to plan constructively for these problems and attitudes.

This will leave the parents with less guilt and less dissatisfaction about what they've been able to do for their boy. When the day comes that they must decide whether to send Donny to a State school or to keep him at home, their decision will represent the healthiest balance for all members of the family.

Or, should a child progress sufficiently to move on to special classes in a public school, the caseworker will be on hand to offer help with the fears and uncertainties that are bound to arise with this new step.

Another important function of Shield of David is research. This is concentrated on finding out how to improve and supplement the institute's services so that more and better help may be given to retarded children and their parents. Underway is an extensive study of the value of working with children of preschool age. The group therapy sessions for parents are also a part of the institute's research; investigators want to know to what degree such therapeutic services improve the child's condition.

Research findings are being toted up on a recently ended 3-year study, and already some general trends are appearing. While most of the children studied do not appear to have improved significantly in strictly intellectual functioning, they have made major gains in social development and self-care. Researchers also note marked improvements in motor development and speech.

Preliminary findings indicate that parents, too, have benefited. They have adopted more positive and constructive attitudes toward the child and his problems and find the home and family situation less tense and stressful than before.

Other products of research at Shield of David are experimental curriculums for infants and for the home training and school groups. Teacher qualifications and competence are being studied in a search for new guideposts in this area. Training procedures and new approaches to psychological evaluation are also being developed.

Difficult decisions are commonplace at the institute. Each staffer is aware of the frustration endured by parents earnestly seeking some relief. Yet not all retarded children profit from the school's services. Some must be rejected in favor of those who can gain most. (During the first 11 months of 1960, 44 of the 64 new children diagnosed were admitted.)

Early experience has taught the institute, for example, that a child of 8 to 10 years who has not yet learned to speak or who is not toilet trained is a very poor candidate for appreciable improvement in these areas. Nowadays the school prefers to concentrate on younger children, even those of severe limitations, whose behavior patterns make them more receptive to learning.

Some of the children rejected are referred to a State school, where they can get the treatment they need in a residential psychi-

atric setting. Some, though retarded, can profit most from association with normal children in an unspecialized nursery, such as a neighborhood day school. Others, it is felt, cannot gain from the institute's program because they need to be away from unhealthy home situations, or because they need more specialized training than the school's part-time program offers.

As the institute has grown, in both size of staff and number of patients, its reputation has spread. Other agencies, such as schools and hospitals, ask to use its facilities; students in this field come to learn; professionals come to observe. Serving as a steady spur to greater efforts is another sign of growth; a constant and growing waiting list.

The dedicated specialists at the Shield of David toil daily in jobs that are at once tremendously satisfying and unending. They are helping a few hundred people find the best emotional solution for the total family in the face of a tragic personal problem. But they are also pioneering in new methods and adding to man's store of knowledge new facts and techniques that may help hundreds of thousands of mentally handicapped and their families. Their research is bringing closer the day when the veil of darkness shrouding the human brain will be torn away and the glare of scientific knowledge will dissolve more of its mysteries.

Yet no one knows better than the people at the Shield of David the mighty challenges ahead.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LANDRUM, for 90 minutes, on Tuesday, April 10.

Mr. THORNBERRY, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, April 10.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. THORNBERRY) for 1 hour, tomorrow, April 10, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNBERRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. INOUE.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2768. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1908. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the "Interstate Commerce Commission Activities, 1937-1962," which is a supplement to the 75th annual report of the Commission, transmitted January 10, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1909. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor and government secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the Government of the Virgin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1961 regular and special sessions, pursuant to the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit applications for entry under the public land agricultural laws to be filed only for lands designated as open to such application, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1912. A letter from the president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America for the calendar year of 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1913. A letter from the president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Auditor's Report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America for the calendar year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 642, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1914. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(d) of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1915. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1916. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1917. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 2 years

the existing provisions of the law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 3, 1962, the following bill was reported on April 6, 1962:

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11151. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 9, 1962]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11131. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8031. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus; with amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields; with amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 3, 1962, the following bill was introduced April 6, 1962:

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 11151. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred April 9, 1962]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 11152. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11153. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11154. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to require that licensees be bonded to insure that all reparation orders are paid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

H.R. 11155. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11157. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit loans to be made under that act to part-time students in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11158. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11159. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex-vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11160. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11161. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11162. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11163. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act in order to extend for 5 additional years the period during which funds for the construction of the National Cultural Center may be obtained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11164. A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11165. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11166. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11167. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11168. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11169. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11170. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11171. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11172. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11173. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11174. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11175. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11176. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11177. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 11178. A bill to amend section 2318 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (relating to reservation of mineral lands) to prohibit sales of gold by the United States for nonmonetary purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11179. A bill to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells aeronautical radio navigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the total cost thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11180. A bill to provide that the National Capital Planning Commission shall undertake a study to determine the best possible location for the National Cultural Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to price supports for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

relative to the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to west coast shipbuilding; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal aid for State Highway Route 115; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11181. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 11182. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 11183. A bill for the relief of Isabel K. Lanning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11184. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel *City of New Orleans* to

American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

291. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to opposing Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. Also, petition of Marjorie Merritt, city clerk, South Pasadena, Calif., relative to opposing legislation that would place an income tax on the income from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, petition of Isabel L. Dedmore, city clerk, Maywood, Calif., relative to opposing legislation for Federal taxation of interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of F. A. Ziemer, city clerk, Vernon, Calif., relative to opposing legislation for Federal taxation of interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. Also, petition of Hisao Uema, president, assembly of the village of Kadena, Okinawa, requesting the return of administrative authority of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner at Huntington, W. Va., Is Addressed by Senator Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, more than 400 persons attended the first Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner which the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County held on Saturday, April 7, 1962. This dinner will be an annual event in Huntington.

Russell Dunbar, a prominent Huntington attorney and active participant in Democratic Party affairs, was toastmaster, and the official party organization was represented by the Democratic State chairman, Robert P. McDonough, of Parkersburg; by the associate Democratic State chairman, Mrs. Thelma Hall, of Madison; and by the Cabell County Democratic chairman, Hanley Morgan. And my good friend and colleague Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH was the principal speaker.

Also present and appropriately recognized were Representative Ken Hechler, of Huntington, who ably represents his district; Hon. Milton Ferguson, mayor of Wayne and a former State tax commissioner; and Mrs. Hilda Long, publisher of the Huntington Advertiser, a daily afternoon newspaper, the editorial policies of which are vigorous in their

espousal of the principles of the Democratic Party and the programs of the administration; and C. H. Koontz, of Charleston, legislative auditor for the West Virginia Legislature.

Although official business prevented Mayor John Durkin, of Huntington, from remaining for the program of the evening, he was present to extend official greetings to the visiting guests and to extend congratulations to the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County, the officers of which are the following:

Mrs. Andrew Kitchen, president; Mrs. Kemp Cottle and Mrs. Joe Gessner, vice presidents; Mrs. John Edwin Greene, treasurer; Mrs. Charles Adkins, secretary; and Mrs. Homer Chapman, corresponding secretary.

State Chairman McDonough, in introducing Senator RANDOLPH, referred to the latter as "Mr. Ready Democrat" and noted that the Senator has pledged active participation in the party's campaign effort in this year's elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech by my colleague at this significant event.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, HOTEL FREDERICK, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1962

Mr. Toastmaster, Chairman McDonough, ladies of the host Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County, and fellow Democrats, it is with gratitude that I acknowledge the privilege afforded me to address this significant gathering.

The officers of the sponsoring Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County inform me that this is the first of what they pledge will be an annual Jefferson-Jackson Day observance in Huntington. Congratulations not only for this splendid beginning, but also for the determination to carry forward into the future.

Real progress has been made and is being made by our country under the aggressive leadership of President John Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

But in assessing the measure and the quality of this progress we should give adequate consideration to the fact that the Kennedy administration has been in office approximately 2 weeks less than a year and a quarter.

In that relatively short span our administration truly has our Nation on the move again. This is so because the Democratic President and Vice President, working with the Democratic Congress, accepted willingly the challenging struggle of the unfinished business of America.

And, my fellow Democrats, ours is an administration imbued with the spirit of the Democratic Party which, although the oldest political party in existence, is still the youngest in this country measured by vitality.

Ours is the party of youth and the administration exemplifies this characteristic under the leadership of a President who sees our country and the world in terms of the tomorrows while not relying entirely on the yesterdays.

It is because the Democratic Party surveys the present in terms of the future that, with only mild interruptions in the past 30 years, we have merited the confidence of the majority of the American people. There is justice in this condition, for our party itself has confidence in the citizen and in the American future.

These qualities—youth, optimism, confidence in the frontiers of the future—lie at the heart of the American spirit and of the

Democratic Party. It was this spirit which again resulted in the mandate of the electorate having been given to our party in 1958 and in 1960.

It is this purpose which continues to animate the Democratic Party and provides it with new vigor and new ideas.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORIES AHEAD

And this purpose, translated into performance, will bring the deserved victories which will be ours in the elections this year—and again in 1964.

The party of the administration in office and in control of the Congress is expected to lose seats in the legislative bodies in an off-year election. But this is not going to occur in 1962. I predict that when the results are tabulated in all States and in all congressional districts there will emerge larger Democratic majorities both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

And in the elections 2 years hence, President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON will be reelected—not by a narrow margin, but by a very substantial plurality.

I do not make these prognostications frivolously, and I do not fashion them from the fabric of pure partisanship.

Bear in mind the remarkable fact that an administration elected by less than 51 percent of the voters enjoys, just slightly more than a year later, a poll rating of approximately 80 percent. This rating has been earned by reason of a record of dedication to duty and real performance.

But, my fellow Democrats, I am not in any degree inviting or suggesting a resting on the oars. We dare not contemplate such a luxury.

PROGRESS EXCELLENT, BUT MORE WORK AHEAD

The record of progress under the alert and aggressive Kennedy administration is excellent. However, there are goals yet to be accomplished. There must be significant additions to the audit of performance in the months and years immediately ahead—and these additions, in some instances, will not be easy to achieve. They will come to fruition only as a consequence of further diligent effort by all of us who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party and who labor to construct meaningful programs for the common good on the foundation of these precepts of our party.

And, of course, it is a time-honored requirement that even the wisely conceived and the best constructed program must have public acceptance and appreciation. We must all work harmoniously and vigorously in efforts to encourage the broadest possible public consensus for the programs of our party. At the bedrock, however, must be efficient and effective party organization and stimulation of voter participation in maximum degree.

So, there is work to be done by each and every one of us. We must all join in meeting these requirements or the victories on the bright horizon will fade into the shadows of the gloom of frustration.

What are some of the major challenges faced and the significant achievements realized by our country during the first year of the new President?

We have an administration which has boldly moved ahead in the field of our relations with other nations.

And notwithstanding turnovers and uneasiness in the domestic political affairs of a number of Western Hemisphere countries, we are justified in asserting that there has been a strengthening of our friends in this hemisphere through the launching of the Alliance-for-Progress program.

We have stood firm at Berlin in the face of threats and bluffs.

We have buttressed NATO by increasing our own strength and by persuading other nations to do likewise.

OUR ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

We have frustrated the Communist efforts to obstruct and neutralize the United Nations. If we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the United Nations must become—an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs.

In addressing a meeting of a unit of the American Association for the United Nations at Charleston, W. Va., on December 8, 1961, I made a statement appropriate to reemphasize. It is this:

As armaments continue to spiral upward we live in ever increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation. In this atmosphere of uncertainty and increasing tension the ultimate testing time of freedom is just now beginning.

The unity which we must create among the free Nations will not remain viable if predicated solely upon a shared antagonism to communism. It must be built on the firmer foundation of a community of aims and aspirations among our allies. And this will require a greater degree of intellectual honesty and hard self-scrutiny than we have heretofore given to the task.

In saying this, I declared last December that I specifically refer to the practice in recent years of the United States depending too heavily on the United Nations as an arena in which to conduct our foreign policy. Too often our willingness to take problems to the U.N. has been a cloak for our own lack of policy. In so doing, we have not strengthened the United Nations, and we have not served the cause of freedom by posing problems which could not be solved in that forum.

I am not suggesting that we "go it alone." I am recommending, however, that we be scrupulously honest in our appraisal of our own ideals and in the capacity of the United Nations to serve them. We do no disservice to the U.N. when we acknowledge that, as presently constituted, there are some problems it cannot solve. Indeed, we may help preserve the United Nations and allow it to grow strong if we do not prematurely overburden it.

I believe there is a cognizance by the present administration of the need for such a reappraisal of our country's role in relationship to that of the United Nations.

PEACE CORPS ACCLAIMED

Perhaps one of the most significant of all achievements the cause of world peace and to identify our country's peaceful efforts and objectives more closely with other countries—especially with the struggling new Nations—was the establishment of the Peace Corps and the beginning of projects during the first year of this infant but fast-maturing agency.

I was a firm believer in the concept of the Peace Corps from the beginning of efforts to bring about its creation. That my name is associated with those of other cosponsors on the legislation which brought the Peace Corps into being is one of the most gratifying developments of my career in the Congress.

It is evident that the Corps has helped to restore, in many underdeveloped sections of the world, the vision of America as a nation committed to the improvement of the life and enhancement of opportunity for all people. And it is heartening to know that in the House of Representatives, where the original Peace Corps measure faced much hostility, there is a popular readiness to grant this vital new agency an increase of more than 100 percent in appropriations and a threefold increase in personnel to enable it to expand its most purposeful endeavors.

In its first year, the administration, with the cooperation of the Congress, doubled the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines, doubled the production capacity of the Minuteman missile, increased by 50 percent the aircraft on ground alert, and doubled the strategic military manpower reserve. These have been significant gains in our country's efforts to bolster our deterrent capability and thus enhance the cause of peace.

Vice President JOHNSON has aptly said, "We have stopped strolling in the space moonlight and have started running toward the moon." It has been a year of big decisions and one of magnificent progress in the field of space and astronautics, including not only Col. John Glenn's successful triple orbiting of the earth, but marked also by the fact that we launched in 1961 eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians. Furthermore, in communications, weather, and navigation, we have made very important scientific strides.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY PROGRAMS BOLD

While achieving the numerous accomplishments so important to our country in its external affairs and in the areas of security and science, the administration and the Congress have taken bold and adventurous steps to improve our domestic economy.

The West Virginia delegation in the Congress has made noteworthy contributions to the support accorded administration proposals, and I give assurance that we have had a real measure of cooperation from the White House and most agencies and departments of the executive establishment.

I am privileged to pay tribute to the high degree of devotion to duty and to the faithfulness of my Democratic colleagues—Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and Representatives KEN HECHLER, CLEVE BAILEY, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, ELIZABETH KEE, and JOHN M. SLACK, JR.—to the principles of our party and the best interests of both the State and the Nation as expressed through their actions in the Congress.

The pace of progress in the vital areas of congressional and administration efforts to improve the economic status of our country and its citizens perhaps has not been as rapid as some of us had hoped.

But again we must take cognizance of the fact that our domestic economic problems have been long in the making and the present administration has been on the scene less than 15 months.

Even though we may manifest impatience in expressing our hopes and expectations concerning domestic economic progress, we should not overlook the fact that at the end of the first year of this administration there were a million more people working than at the same time the prior year. And income from wages and salaries advanced 7 percent while, at the same time, net farm income increased by more than a billion dollars, or approximately 6 percent.

Last month, the President, in speaking of a February drop in unemployment, remarked: "I think this economy has more vitality in it than some of its premature mourners." He was able to point to the fact that the number of unemployed in the Nation declined by 120,000 to 4,543,000. This represented a 19-month low of 5.6 percent of the work force—still too high, of course, but an improvement.

It is essential that we look realistically at some economic facts.

The American economy has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent, without inflationary strain, during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production; States in uniform dollars.

OUR INADEQUATE GROWTH RATE

But during the period 1953-61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent,

or hardly better than half the rate required—in view of the ever-accelerating technology—to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This unsatisfactory record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few sectors of the economy, has become generally distributed throughout most of the important areas of the economy. And we find, too, that a very large and consistent increase in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

What is the outlook for improvement in the economic picture based on business spending on factories and equipment? Fortune magazine estimates spending in this area of economic activity will be at a rate of \$40 billion. If this rate develops as forecasted, the previous peak record established in 1957 will be exceeded and the increase will measure 15 percent over 1961.

Fortune's experts emphasized—and economists in Government agree—that conditions are right for the businessman to add zest to the economic recovery for these reasons:

First, the need for investing in modernization of plants and in cost-saving production equipment is imperative.

Second, the cash to finance the construction is available.

Third, the Government is taking vital steps to encourage the spending.

Fourth, the usual tendency of businessmen is to expand their spending budgets over initial plans during a period of business advancement.

The real answers, of course, are months away—but the prospects seem to be reasonably favorable.

INDUSTRY MUST MODERNIZE

Standpatism, lethargy, and obsolescence are the enemies of progress in this age of advancing technology and rapid change. Investments in facilities and equipment—in other words, modernization and expansion—by American industry will be the key to the continuing success of democracy and the free enterprise system in the competition with communism.

We must have not only the men to match our times but, also, the forceful leadership within our business community which will forge a future filled with a challenge to achieve and the faith to accomplish our country's goals and better serve the national interest and the cause of peace.

We have an administration which is aggressive and progressive. And I have faith that the end product of the labors of the 87th Congress will be conducive to a bolstering of the businessman's outlook and planning.

But the American who holds the key to whether our country's current economic upswing stays strong through 1962 and well into 1963 is in considerable degree, the U.S. businessman.

If the businessman comes through with a sharp stepup in his spending for new plants and modern equipment in the months ahead our economy will be stronger. The upturn,

which began precisely a year ago, will have the power to continue for a long time.

If the businessman, however, invests only subnormal totals in factories and equipment, we are in for trouble. Once more the upturn will falter, and we will be facing the threat of the fifth recession of the post-World War II period uncomfortably soon.

The American consumers have done and are doing their part in sustaining the advance by increasing their spending. Likewise, government at every level—Federal, State, and local—also has been performing and is performing its part in aiding the economic recovery by broadening expenditures.

But the expansion induced by Government and the consumers is a year old.

Consumers are not going to continue boosting their spending if the economy shows signs of sliding again.

So the conclusion to be reached is that the next stimulant must come from higher business spending.

WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMIC PICTURE

With reference to our West Virginia situation, there are both elements of encouragement and discouragement in the latest State department of employment security report.

The favorable factors are these: At mid-February, 527,400 persons were employed throughout the State, representing a gain of 100 from mid-January and 600 over the previous year. Total unemployed numbered 76,100, a drop of 8,100 during the month and 29,300 lower than a year ago.

Unfavorable, however, is the fact that the civilian labor force dropped to an estimated 603,500, which is 28,700 lower than mid-February 1961. This indicates extensive outmigration of our workers.

Meanwhile, however, there is a measure of encouragement to be read in the March issue of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.'s "Business in West Virginia" summary, which reports:

"Business activity in West Virginia advanced on a broad front in February. The second consecutive strong monthly increase further confirmed the opinion that December's pause was a temporary one." It was noted, too, that more than a year has passed since the bottom of West Virginia's recession in December 1960, and there was reassurance in the declaration that "the index of gross State product has already risen 10 points during the recovery and now exceeds the level achieved in 1957—a strong year for the economies of West Virginia and the Nation. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, which reached 17.4 percent during the recession, has dropped to 9.9 percent of the labor force."

In line with the unfavorable element of the employment security department report, the telephone company summary also includes the realistic observation that "job openings in the State, however, have been insufficient to absorb most jobless workers who, it is generally believed, have migrated to other States. Thus, employment has barely exceeded the low point of the past recession."

This bears out the national experience; namely, that the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

OUR PROGRAM NEEDS

It is clearly indicated, therefore, that there must be acceleration of economic growth at both the State and national levels. It indicates, too, that there is need for the Area Redevelopment Act program signed into law by the Democratic President after prior vetoes by his predecessor of the other party. It attests to the requirement that the loan

activities of the very helpful Small Business Administration be accelerated at the more realistic pace being maintained by SBA under this administration. It means that the manpower retraining features of the Area Redevelopment Act and the sweeping new Manpower Utilization and Training Act passed by Congress and signed by the President last month provide important tools to be brought into action with dispatch and vigor. It means that there is validity in the President's recommended long-range antirecession public works program with its provision for partial implementation at the earliest possible date. It means—especially for West Virginia and other coal-producing States, that the Government's coal research programs must be accelerated, as the present administration gives evidence of being determined to do.

These are purposeful programs intended to aid industrial, economic, and manpower development. No one of these programs alone will perform a miracle, but in combination they will be helpful. They have to do with business and industrial expansion and manpower utilization. Thus, they are meaningful in the sense that they are keyed to both the improvement of economic growth and the affording of new job opportunities. The element of "dole" is not present in these programs.

In West Virginia our foremost needs are industrial expansion and diversification. This is not a statement of new need. These have been our obvious requirements for a number of years, and especially since the mid-1950's when rapid mechanization of coal mining brought an acceleration of manpower displacement in that basic industry.

It is indicated and it is appropriate that a tribute be paid to the efforts of many dedicated citizens of our State and helpful citizens of other States who have been devotedly and vigorously assisting in the aggressive campaign to bring about the industrial expansion and diversification so vitally needed.

STATE ADMINISTRATION, LEGISLATURE AND PARTY LEADERSHIP MERIT PRAISE

And here, too, I am privileged to express a special sense of gratification concerning the outstanding accomplishments of our Democratic State administration under the persuasive leadership of Gov. Wally Barron, and with the vigorous cooperation of the Democratic legislature. Together, they have faced trying conditions with courage, boldness, and imagination. They have fashioned and implemented programs and instrumentalities which give promise of providing lasting solutions for grave problems.

I commend especially the establishment of the West Virginia State Department of Commerce and the creation of a Washington Liaison Office staffed by a special assistant to the Governor. Those of us representing our State in the Congress have reason to know and to be grateful for the work of these new offices and the capable services being performed by Commerce Commissioner Hulett Smith and the Governor's Special Assistant, Paul Crabtree.

The fact is that Hulett and Paul are symbols of the seldom before duplicated quality and degree of cooperative spirit which prevails between the Federal Government and the State government—and between the State's Democratic Party headed by Bob McDonough and the National Democratic Party and the Kennedy administration.

The esprit de corps engendered by these relationships are of inestimable value to our people and will doubtless augur well for the future of the Democratic Party in West Virginia.

Knowing of the real affection President Kennedy has for West Virginia and being aware of his expression of sympathetic interest in our problems, we have doubtless

been too prone to expect quick, miracle-type solutions through Federal Government intervention and actions.

Make no mistake about it, my fellow West Virginians, we have been accorded recognition and a substantial measure of assistance from our national Government. But we must bear in mind that the laws and regulations which apply to the other 49 States also apply to West Virginia in matters such as the negotiation and awarding of Government contracts, the making of loans, and the awarding of grants.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS HELP EMPLOYMENT

With a helpful degree of sympathetic understanding and a more cooperative spirit prevailing in Washington, our businessmen and industrialists are coming more and more to bid competitively and to negotiate with a reasonable degree of success for Government contracts. Consequently, we are no longer the almost totally overlooked and non-participating State in this area of activity which has real potential for improving our economic status and job opportunities for our workers. This is attested to especially by the substantial defense and non-defense prime contracts won competitively during the past year by Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant, by the FMC Corporation Ordnance Division of South Charleston, by the Carroll Division of Watson Electronics at Martinsburg, and by the Hercules Powder Co. at Rocket Center near Keyser. New employment afforded under these contracts will exceed 3,000 jobs.

We have reason to be optimistic that other prime contracts will be awarded to firms producing or planning to produce in West Virginia in the near future to provide even more jobs.

Another favorable development during the past year has been the location within our State of branch production units of well established prime defense contractors, notably, facilities of the aircraft and missile industries for the first time—Lockheed at Clarksburg and North American Aviation at Princeton; the highly diversified Melpar, a division of Westinghouse Air Brake, at Fairmont; and Harrington and Richardson's West Virginia Ordnance Co. subsidiary at Wheeling to produce under that Massachusetts company's defense contracts.

We are gratified to have Kaiser Aluminum expanding extensively near Ravenswood, to have Corning Glass increasing operations in our State, to have Virginia Electric & Power Co. installing a huge new operation in Grant County, and to have the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway substantially augmenting the staff and payroll here in Huntington by concentrating talent and activities in the former Government-surplus plant it acquired within the past year. There are many other plants I could list.

We have considered where we have been during the first year and a quarter of the present Democratic administrations in Washington and Charleston. Now where are we going?

We must induce and enable our businessmen to expand, to outthink, to outmanage, and outproduce our adversaries. We must rally our workers to make the best of everything with efficiency and at the lowest cost.

TRADE, TAX, AGED CARE MEASURES

This means we must have a more modern trade program—but one which will be equitable and just to domestic industries and American workers, whether producing for export or for domestic markets in competition with imports from abroad.

It means, too, that the tax program to be passed by the Congress must likewise be a modern one which will enhance our national growth and be equitable.

Medical care for the aged should be strengthened. I stand with the administration for expanding the social security system

to provide insured coverage for all senior citizens eligible or to become eligible to participate in that system. The national chairman of the other party admitted a few days ago that existing programs for care of the aged are inadequate. He does not yet join us in favoring the social security approach—but he and his party seem to be withdrawing reluctantly from their former no retreat policy.

Antirecession legislation should be provided, and a cornerstone seems to me to be the public works program proposed by the President, and now including a plan for immediate implementation of an employment acceleration measure similar to one I joined Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, in cosponsoring in the 1st session of this 87th Congress.

I associate myself with a recent remark by our Vice President in which he declared that we have a long way to go—a hard way to go—but we are moving. We have begun, as President Kennedy admonished us to do in his world-acclaimed inaugural address. And if we will close ranks our party will be remembered and our country will be preserved.

Needed: Youth Development and Anti-delinquency Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the youth—of Wisconsin and America—represent one of the greatest, most precious assets of our national life.

The future of our Nation—of freedom itself—of the ideals in which we believe: All of these values depend upon our youth of today—our leaders of tomorrow.

We, as adult citizens, however, must ask ourselves: Are we creating a national climate for best utilization and development of the great reservoir of energy, imagination, and talent—as well as morality—of youth; or, is present-day environment allowing dissipation and waste of this priceless human resource?

Recently, I was privileged to discuss the outlook in these fields in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today there are more than 66 million boys and girls under 18 years of age—the hope of America of tomorrow.

As a nation, however, we have a special concern for, and interest in, the more than 12 million youth between 12 and 17 years—the teenagers. Why? At this age, these boys and girls are emerging from the shelter of homelife into the outside world.

However, let me make this clear: Graduation into society should not, and must not, provide an excuse for either: (1) Abdication of the responsibility of parents; or (2) for society to develop spoon-feeding pampering programs.

The challenge, rather, is to create the kind of programs to progressively absorb the developing capabilities of youth into useful activities, both in homelife and in the community.

The time has passed when our youth can be expected, in a taken-for-granted kind of way, to easily or automatically integrate into our society. Rather, this can be accomplished successfully only by careful, creative, farsighted planning.

Among other things, we need to (1) encourage adult interest in, and leadership for, this gigantic challenge; (2) provide greater opportunity for participation in civic, church, recreational, and other activities; and (3) opening new job opportunities. Despite the fact that the Nation still has 4 million adult unemployed—for whom we must find jobs—we must also plan for jobs for the 26 million young folks entering the labor force in the next 10 years.

As well, this involves earlier beginnings of vocational training—to equip youth for useful employment.

The Nation, if it fails to create such positive programs, however, can expect that delinquency—instead of being reduced—will grow.

Following a recent study, the allegation was made that we waste a million kids a year. Such a vast army of jobless, useless—and sometimes placeless—youth, could be real social dynamite—a wellspring of delinquency and crime.

Unfortunately, the high rate of delinquency among youth often is preceded—or accompanied—by adult, and, yes, even community delinquency.

Naturally, this does not absolve our young folks, themselves, from utilizing their God-instilled sense of morality and responsibility. Nevertheless—it does demonstrate that the pointing finger of accusation at youth, sometimes can correctly be turned around—requiring a soul searching in adult behavior, mores and moral conduct—and, yes, laws.

For these reasons, then, we also need realistic efforts to discourage delinquencies, including the following:

1. Reemphasize that any delinquency efforts—first and foremost—are the responsibilities of the home—the parents of America.
2. Expand positive efforts by the churches, schools, teachers' association, fraternal, service, and other groups to carry on youth development programs.
3. Modernize our courts and penal correctional institutions to meet the unique problems in this field.
4. As necessary, strengthen Federal laws to prohibit traffic of weapons, narcotics, obscene literature, and other such materials falling into the hands of young folks.
5. Encourage higher standards of presentations through television, radio, magazines, books, and other media.

In attempting to create more effective youth development programs, our society also must not fail to stress—in its news reporting and community recognition programs—that more than 95 percent of our youth are conducting themselves dutifully, constructively, and usefully as keystones in home and community life.

The National Lottery of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an example of cultural advancement through gambling revenues. I refer specifically to the national

lottery of Finland where the proceeds are divided between the National Opera, the National Theatre and the Ministry of Education.

Finland is a small nation of a little over 4 million persons, but size notwithstanding, it is noted for cultural and artistic attainment. The Finns are not a rich people, and they find it difficult to provide for the sustenance and promotion of their cultural heritage. They are quite dependent upon the national lottery as a means to this end. There is no evidence that they find this money somewhat tainted, for unlike many Americans they are not plagued by pious hypocrisy in these matters.

The national lottery of Finland brings in over \$4,330,000 a year based on the 1961 figures. About one-third of this money goes to the treasury in the form of revenue. The lottery in this country is a small operation but produces big results.

Mr. Speaker, if we were not blind to human and financial reality, we could learn quite a bit from the Finns. A national lottery in the United States could bring a tremendous lift to our taxpayers. We could, painlessly and voluntarily, raise over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue and apply it toward tax cuts and reduction of our national debt.

Proposed Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives three bills dealing with civil rights.

President Kennedy in his state-of-the-Union message this year stressed the importance of human rights, and emphasized the fact that there is still much to be done in the field of civil rights.

My first bill provides for the abolition of the literacy test and other performance examinations as a qualification for voting. Such arbitrary and unreasonable discrimination has no place in our democracy, although unfortunately it has been used as a means of depriving many of our citizens from exercising their right to vote. As I pointed out in a statement recently before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee, 19 States have literacy requirements, including my own State of New York. The law in New York is restrictive in that it requires voters to be able to read and write English. It is most unfortunate that this requirement thus works to prevent so many of our Puerto Rican citizens who are literate in Spanish but not in English from participating in elections. This was estimated as affecting some 200,000 Puerto Ricans in 1961. When Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship 45 years ago they were permitted to choose between English and Spanish as the official language; and to

penalize them now for making a free choice is certainly most unfair and undemocratic.

In its 1961 report the Civil Rights Commission indicated that in some instances voting discrimination on racial grounds was practiced by requiring voters not only to be able to read and write, but to give a "satisfactory interpretation" of the Constitution, and to calculate their age to the very day.

My bill will protect the right of all citizens, including the Puerto Ricans, to participate in Federal elections if they have at least a sixth-grade education, regardless of race, creed, or color. It will prevent the misuse of so-called literacy tests in some of our Southern States in keeping qualified Negroes from voting, but would also protect the right of the individual State to make literacy a qualification for voting.

My second bill provides for the prompt desegregation of public schools. It is most appropriate that the Congress of the United States enunciate the law of the land in spelling out the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954, which held that there should be no segregation in public schools. President Kennedy has pointed out that a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color, among them the right to free public education.

This bill would provide that assignment of all students to public schools would be made irrespective of race or color, and would require every school board to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months from the date of enactment of the bill. It permits the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if called upon to do so, to render technical assistance to school boards in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of such desegregation plans, and to grant financial assistance where necessary to carry out such plans.

One of the main provisions of the bill would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to institute a civil action against any school board which fails to put into effect a plan of school desegregation within the time specified.

Our public school system must be preserved and strengthened, and no child should be denied his right to a free public education because of his race, color, creed, or national origin.

The third bill calls for the establishment of the Civil Rights Commission as a permanent agency within the executive branch of the Government, and requires the submission of a yearly report to the President and the Congress on its activities of the preceding year and on any recommendations for further action. The Commission has done a remarkable job in the past in bringing to light some of the problems of discrimination in this country, and in bringing about a realization of the national objective of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens. It can certainly continue its work in the field of human rights, thus guaranteeing that there will be no denial of constitutional rights to any of our fellow Americans.

As the leader in the effort to establish man's dignity as an individual, entitled

to certain basic rights and freedoms, we must prove to the entire world, particularly to those countries behind the Iron Curtain and to those on the brink, that the United States is a land where such freedoms and the rights of each and every individual are respected and protected by the highest standards of justice. If we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom, and equality to the rest of the world, the Congress must fulfill its responsibilities and enact strong laws which will absolutely guarantee these rights regardless of race, ancestry, color, religion, or national origin.

I therefore urge that the House of Representatives give prompt and favorable consideration to these measures.

The Great Economic Issue Today: Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. INOUE. Mr. Speaker, in our struggle with the Communists, the United States has often been lectured "to get off the defensive and seize the initiative." However, as President Kennedy noted:

While this is not an unreasonable urge, its concrete application is more difficult. In the military area, the initiative rests with the aggressor—a role that we shun by nature and tradition and our alliances are largely, therefore, defensive. In the paramilitary arenas of subversion, intimidation, and insurrection, an open and peaceful society is again at a disadvantage. But there is one area in particular where the initiative can and has been ours—an area of strategic importance in which we have the capacity for a still greater effort—the area of economic policy.

The Marshall plan, point 4, and the Alliance for Progress are examples of our initiative in this area. These programs were devised not only to thwart communism but to strike a blow for freedom.

THE GREAT ECONOMIC ISSUE TODAY: TRADE

The great international issue today—one with far greater consequences than any foreign aid program—is the U.S. trade policy. Our trade policy affects our national security, for our military and economic commitments abroad must be paid for by a favorable balance of trade. Our trade policy affects every sector of our economy.

The crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres by the American farmer is sold on the foreign market. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 45 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production are exported.

We export twice as many manufactured products as we import. Since 1945, machinery, vehicles, wood, paper, and chemical exports from the United States have doubled. One out of every three workers in manufacturing is employed in a firm that exports. Thousands more owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports.

Our export industries are our strongest, most efficient, and highest paying growth industries, and not our lowest paying industries. A good example is U.S. coal—almost \$55 million was sold to the Japanese in 1960 and 1961. The U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times more per hour than a Japanese coal miner, but he produces 14 times as much coal so that the real cost per ton of U.S. coal is far smaller.

Today, about 60 to 65 percent of our imports do not compete with the goods we produce. Forty percent of our imports are raw materials. More than 90 percent of our manganese or chrome ore for our steel mills is imported, as is 84 percent of the bauxite for our aluminum.

To state it more graphically, if the United States stopped trading abroad, the shortage and price rise would make these items virtually nonexistent: coffee, cocoa, spices, anything in tin cans, aluminum kitchenware, new radios, television sets, telephones, washing machines, and cars.

While exports represent about 3.9 percent of the gross national product in 1960, or about \$1 out of every \$25, American exports account for more than one-sixth of the world commerce.

TRADE IN PERSPECTIVE

What do all these statistics mean? It means that the United States is consuming more raw materials than our land is capable of producing; that we are not self-sufficient in a wide variety of minerals; that exports are crucial to the prosperity of many of our farmers and some segments of industry. Furthermore, the U.S. needs for raw materials will increase, for the rate of population increase in the United States is among the highest of the world's major countries.

We are the world's largest trading nation and many free world countries depend on our imports and exports. We, in turn, must look to exports to pay not only for our raw materials but to help us pay for our other overseas expenses such as maintaining troops in Berlin; to pay for our aid to less developed countries; to pay for the deficits caused by the outflow of American capital to tax-haven nations.

In 1959, the United States ran a deficit in its balance of payments of \$3.7 billion; in 1960 it was \$3.9 billion. In 1961 this deficit is estimated at over \$1.5 billion. This deficit will grow unless it is offset by foreign investments in the United States and a favorable balance of trade.

But more important, trade will determine the size and shape of the free world. Japan, Canada, Philippines, Chile, Venezuela, Peru, India, Uruguay, Liberia, Pakistan, and other free world countries must have access to new markets for their raw materials and new manufactured goods if their economies are to expand to meet the demands and needs of their people, and if their new industries are to be successful. If the free nations do not offer growing trade opportunities with the West—opportunities which will allow them to pay eventually for their needs with exports—these countries will be forced to turn to the Communist bloc for their market.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

In the sixties, some 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may soon be concentrated in two great markets: The United States and the European Economic Community, popularly known as the European Common Market. The United States has a population of 185 million and a gross national product of \$500 billion. The European Common Market, including the United Kingdom which has applied to become a member, has a population of 250 million and a gross national product of \$245 billion. The U.S. exports to Western Europe account for one-fourth of our total exports.

Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. policy has been to support greater European unity. Our aim was twofold; to curb the kind of European nationalism which led to two World Wars by encouraging the establishment of a common economic system, and to help create a strong Western Europe which would help guard the security and prosperity of free nations. The pooling of French and German coal and steel production under a common authority was one step toward that direction.

The Marshall plan brought the statesmen of these nations together. The United States asked them to determine not just the needs of their respective countries, but the needs of Western Europe.

In 1958, six European nations—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—signed a treaty to bring about a European economic community. The treaty members pledged to: First, remove tariffs and other trade barriers among themselves; second, create a uniform system to regulate trade between themselves and the rest of the world; third, abolish restrictions on the movement of labor, capital, business enterprises and services within the new community; fourth, coordinate monetary and fiscal policies in order to promote high employment and stable prices in each country; and, fifth, establish a common agricultural policy.

The Common Market nations set a timetable of 12 to 15 years to accomplish the reduction of tariffs. Trade barriers among the original six members have been reduced by 50 percent at the beginning of 1962, nearly 2 years ahead of schedule. Other countries, notably former colonies of members of the Common Market, were accepted as associated states and have free access to the Common Market.

For Alliance for Progress countries, the special concessions made to former European colonies, particularly the African states, accentuate Latin America's trade problems, for both continents produce cotton, coffee, bananas, and other fruit.

The Common Market with its common external tariff wall against the rest of the world, presents a serious threat of discrimination against American exports and against the goods of free nations such as Canada, Japan, and countries in Latin America.

How much of a handicap this tariff will be, depends on the imported product and Europe's demand for it. The Com-

mon Market has indicated its willingness to bargain down its external tariff in exchange for trading concessions with outsiders, particularly the United States.

Hence, whether or not these two enormous markets in the free world will grow apart and engage in a trade war or whether they will expand the flow of trade and thereby stimulate and strengthen the respective economies will be determined by the trade policy of the United States.

HAWAII AND FOREIGN TRADE

Foreign trade has a direct impact on the life and livelihood of the American people in every State. Any change in tariffs could bring about serious dislocations in a State's economy causing the closing of some plants and unemployment with all its social problems.

It is difficult to gauge the exact effect of world trade on Hawaii. Recently, the tariff on Hawaiian pineapple was raised in the Common Market. This move was not unexpected, for pineapples from French territories have had a distinct advantage over Hawaii in sales to Common Market countries. However, this increase in tariff could mean a further loss of the West German market which, heretofore, was the leading overseas buyer of Hawaiian pineapple products.

The extent to which Hawaii is involved with international trade should be emphasized. In 1960 Hawaii exported \$44 million of agricultural products, or roughly 15 percent of the islands' total agricultural produce. Included were \$41.5 million for field crops, \$1.1 million for livestock and livestock products, \$984,000 for fruits and nuts, and \$377,000 for vegetables.

In 1960 exports of manufactured goods from Hawaii were estimated at \$15.5 million. This is less than 1 percent of the gross State product. But over 23,000 workers or over 9 percent of the labor force are employed by manufacturing establishments reporting exports of \$25,000 a year or more. These firms range from Dole Corp., Libby McNeill & Libby, California Packing Corp., to California Ink Co., Pacific Chemical & Fertilizer, Honolulu Iron Works, to smaller apparel and furniture companies.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in June. If our exports are to retain and expand their position in the world market, and if the aim of our foreign policy is to bring about this greatest advance in increased living standards, especially in newly developed areas, our trade policy must be revised, not extended.

The United States needs a trade policy that grants new authority first, to negotiate broad trade agreements rather than one that negotiated item by item—a bargaining technique obsolete in many cases; second, to exchange tariff concessions; and, third, to increase trade to strengthen our balance of payments.

Of utmost importance is the retention of the most-favored-nation principle which would assure our other trading partners that any tariff concessions would be extended to them.

The new Trade Act should also contain some kind of trade adjustment program to give prompt and effective help to those firms and workers who face genuine hardships as a result of competition from increased imports. The aim of such a program would be to help firms modernize their equipment and plants, to help firms and workers move into lines of work in which they can compete more effectively.

I feel that the United States should equip itself to meet the challenge and the advantages that the European Common Market offers by adopting a liberal trade policy. The alternative is to retreat from some overseas commitments which are vital to the security of the free world. This is unacceptable.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas, April 7, 1962)

The second supplemental appropriation passed with House membership refusing to go on record (not enough Members arose to support the demand for a record vote). Earlier, on a motion to recommit, the bill failed 235 to 153. I voted to recommit to limit the U.S. portion of the United Nations payment. It seems wrong to me for us to pay \$25 million toward the Katanga-Congo dispute, when other nations are failing to do their part. For that matter, the time is long overdue when each nation should bear the same share as every other or those, like the United States, contributing more should have a larger vote percentage to match their contribution. As in the U.S. income tax, so in the United Nations—the Communist doctrine is followed from each according to ability to pay, to each according to his needs. So we continue to belittle success and achievement and aggrandize inability, a sure way to stultify the accomplishment of a world of self-respecting and respectful neighbors. Freeloaders, do-gooders, something-for-nothings are part of this pattern, hardly a sound basis for a realistic world of hard knocks. The appropriation bill, totaling \$431.8 million, highlighted again our worsening fiscal position. As the Kennedy spending demands grow the deficit increases, and now we learn the gross national product and tax income will be less than anticipated. The deficit widens even more.

The Peace Corps amendment, asking Congress to up the next year's expense from the earlier request of \$40 to \$64 million, passed, 316 to 70, although many Members felt the program too new for accurate evaluation and increase. It appears that Government is moving into private missionary efforts, including YMCA, YWCA, and others. At the outset few realize the ultimate domination of Government when participating in joint projects. In this instance, private and religious missionary work will be replaced. Few, if any, know where the Peace Corps is going. Many Members, even proponents, agree the foreign aid program is long overdue a general

review and overhauling. The buildup for its continuation and expansion is beginning.

President Goulart, of Brazil, proved again the adage "the best defense is a good offense." Instead of apologizing or defending the expropriation of American industry he proclaimed that other property will be taken and paid for, if, as, and when he sees fit. For this, the United States winced and dined him and gave him the key to the Treasury. Apparently, he will get \$100 million or more as a gift. Castro's success has undermined U.S. prestige and property throughout this hemisphere, until every Latin American nation is further prey now to Communists and anti-U.S. sentiment. We now further aid and abet our demise by lauding the expropriators and rewarding them by grants of money. It's almost too fantastic to be believable and some say Mr. Kennedy's popularity is greater than ever. Meanwhile, Cuba is arming militarily with Russian planes, tanks, and artillery. The United States complacently rests easy 90 miles away. Ninety miles is no missile gap. And the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

A public works pump priming \$600 million to help unemployment has been asked by the President even as Congress is asked to consider a \$2 billion standby fund to combat future recessions. The pump priming failures of the past have taught this administration little, it seems. Public works projects fail since the unemployed are not in these areas, by trade or geographically, and, worse yet, recessions are encouraged by the tax take of the Federal Government from the taxpayer to pay for these projects. Where's the money coming from? Is still the appropriate question.

Floor debate on the administration's propaganda to support legislation asked of Congress brought to light shocking power plays by the President and his lieutenants. Not only is the taxpayers' money spent incorrectly for this purpose, but the propaganda is false and misleading. The administration admits (p. 5926, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 4) distributing material widely to explain and support the legislative requests. In debate I pointed out the State Department's widely distributed pamphlet called *Together We Grow Strong*, which says that U.S. auto industry could not exist without oil from Kuwait. Other equally fallacious representations about world trade are being distributed to accompany our present consideration of the Trade Expansion Act. It is becoming quite apparent that administration claims of a freer trade bill are absolutely misleading and erroneous.

Muzzling of the press is a danger today, greater than ever before. The portrayal of this situation in the U.S. News & World Report, April 9 issue, is a real eye opener. The title, "The Kennedy Image, How It's Built," could be reentitled "A Dictator's Demands of the News Media." Here again, the naive idealistic average citizen who thinks "it can't happen here" is unaware of the real danger, it seems to me. When a news reporter is threatened or punished by being denied news material because he failed earlier to depict the President as he wished to be depicted, news control is complete. The problem today is now one of both sides of the issues getting through to the people. When you realize that the liberal or radical side, such as Keynesian economics, Fabian socialism, communism, the ADA views, and labor leaders' legislative observations do get complete coverage you can estimate the brainwash of our people. Unfortunately, there are too few conservative media, writers and commentators.

The imbalance of the professional staffs of the House committees which are loaded with Democratic appointees poses a serious threat to good government and proper representation of all the people. This week I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 538, to insure that the minority party is

given adequate staff help on all House committees. House committee figures have been collected to show that staff members responsible to the Democrats total 462 while only 39 staff members on House committees are responsible to the Republicans.

Speech by Hon. Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of March of this year, the able and distinguished Congressman from the Third District of Wisconsin, the Honorable VERNON W. THOMSON, former Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, and I were on a program at the Southeastern Dairy Marketing Clinic, held at Chattanooga, Tenn. He and I discussed there the pros and cons of the proposed Federal milk sanitation legislation, and his people who favor that legislation can rest assured that he was, as he always is, a determined advocate of their cause. He made a magnificent presentation and I am happy here to include it in the RECORD, as presented by him:

PRESENTATION BY CONGRESSMAN VERNON W. THOMSON AT THE SOUTHEASTERN DAIRY MARKETING CLINIC, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

I am a Representative in Congress from America's Dairyland, the State where men are men and the dairy cow is queen. Let me put this into perspective for you. The U.S. Department of Agriculture tells us, for instance, that our friends in South Carolina produced 540 million pounds of milk in 1961; in Georgia, 1,032 million pounds were produced; in Tennessee, 2,347 million; while in Wisconsin we produced last year 17,997 million pounds of milk. In terms of cash farm income from milk, in South Carolina it represents 6.9 percent; in Georgia it represents 6.4 percent; in Tennessee, it represents 15.4 percent; while in Wisconsin it represents 53.7 percent of cash farm income.

In my capacity both as Governor of Wisconsin and as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have been deeply and directly concerned with the promotion of a sound and prosperous dairy economy for my State and our Nation.

I would like to present to you the viewpoint of the Wisconsin dairy producer on this vital issue of milk sanitation legislation. First, let me say that I have absolutely no desire, nor do the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, to hurt the farmers of Tennessee, New York, Texas, or any other State. It is just a fact of life in this world in which we live that some groups are always anxious to preserve the status quo. This situation not only exists between different groups on different commodities, but it has been apparent many times right within the dairy industry itself. It has happened not only on the national level, but, I think we can all fairly say, it has also happened within our own States. The dairy industry as a whole is one of the most important ones in America today, and I think we can all agree that it is faced with some very serious problems. Of course there are a variety of causes for this, but I submit that one of the most important causes of our trouble is and has been the erection of artificial trade barriers

that are not based on common sense or sanitary standards.

We in Wisconsin do not seek to gain any unfair advantages over local dairy farmers in other areas of America. Dairy farmers located next to large metropolitan markets have a number of advantages based simply on geography. Now, if all our Wisconsin dairy farmers could resettle around the city of New York or around the cities covered by the now existing 81 Federal milk marketing orders, they would have no cause to complain. Unfortunately, however, they are not, so they must ship milk from long distances, pay expensive transportation costs and then face an uphill fight for markets which in many instances are dominated by unduly restrictive local economic barriers acclaimed as sanitation standards: Such as requiring a certain model of drinking cup in a barn by Chicago, requiring a certain exterior finish on bulk tanks in Pennsylvania, longer legs on bulk tanks than the 3-A standards in Louisiana, 400 cubic feet of air space per stallion in Maryland, while Washington, D.C., requires 600, Ohio requires gutters 16 inches wide and 8 inches deep, while Nevada prescribes 14 inches wide and 4 inches in depth. Washington, D.C., requires individual cloth towels which are laundered and sanitized after each usage or a single service paper towel to wipe the udder of each cow. Nevada requires the milk house to be windward from the barn, while California requires a two-room milk house. Many municipalities refuse to accept milk produced or handled under the supervision of other jurisdictions having substantially equivalent dairy standards, such as Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans. The innumerable variety of inspections per year required by different jurisdictions and the impossible and costly duplication of inspections (Wisconsin, 23) are but a sampling of the conflicts of regulation and the multiplication of costs and uncertainties faced by a farmer attempting to qualify to serve an out-of-State market.

Let's take a look at this basic issue in the perspective of time, the past, the present, and the future. Restrictive trade devices, as you know, are nothing new. They have been devised and erected since the beginning of man's first venture into commerce and trade. They still exist in many shapes and forms today in all parts of the world. They existed in 1776 when the American Colonies threw off the yoke of English oppression and formed our great Nation.

The early efforts of the Founding Fathers, as you know, resulted in the Articles of Confederation, which in effect represented a customs union. Later, when the device proved to be ineffective, the Constitution was adopted, making the United States truly a political union. Even in the days of the Confederation, tariffs, trade restrictions, and taxes were recognized as unhealthy for a prosperous economy. The Constitution specifically protected free trade among the States and a large body of constitutional law has been built on the proposition that no one State can discriminate in commerce against her sister States. This principle of encouraging the free flow of goods and commodities in interstate commerce has allowed our Nation to grow and prosper.

It lets Detroit make our cars, and it lets Iowa raise our hogs. It lets Milwaukee brew our beer, and it lets California and Florida produce our oranges, and Tennessee produce Jack Daniels. The Constitution doesn't prevent other States from making cars, raising hogs, brewing beer, or growing oranges, of course, but it allows the most efficient and economical producers in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, California, Florida, and Tennessee to do so by prohibiting the other States from erecting restrictive and burdensome barriers to the free flow of the goods and commodities.

The Wisconsin dairyfarmer then simply asks, "Why not let me have the opportunity to produce dairy products more efficiently?"

So much for the past. Let's look at the present in regard to dairying. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, the law under which Federal milk marketing orders are established, has a provision in section 2(C)(5)(G) which states:

"(G) No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof produced in any production area in the United States."

This provision was inserted into the law many years ago by the late Representative August Andresen, of Minnesota, who for over 30 years served on the House Committee on Agriculture.

This amendment was accepted by Congress for the very reason that it was the clear congressional intent that trade barriers should not be built up in this country between various sections of the Nation in the marketing of milk. It is still on the lawbooks today but, unfortunately, it is not being realistically enforced. If the Administration farm bill now pending before Congress were passed in its present form, even this provision would, in fact, be nullified.

What, then, the Wisconsin dairyfarmer asks, is the difference between a policy of prohibiting or limiting the marketing of milk in any one area of the country and prohibiting or limiting the marketing of oranges in any one area of the country? Is it any more justifiable for a local segment of the dairy industry in Hawaii, for example, to prohibit Wisconsin milk than it would be for orangegrowers in an Alaskan hothouse to prohibit the sale of California oranges in Alaska?

The marketing problems of our Wisconsin dairyfarmers is only one aspect of the problem, of course. Its twin is local sanitary standards. The proposals in Congress to establish a uniform standard to prevent discrimination in this regard are both fair and reasonable.

The standards proposed in those bills are high standards. The Public Health Service model ordinance and code, which is the standard in those bills, was developed with the aid of a national advisory committee of experts in public health, dairy, and veterinary science.

Since the code was first established in 1924, it has been revised 12 times to keep abreast of modern techniques and new scientific knowledge. These standards are currently in effect in over 1,900 communities and 35 States. It is a standard which provides consumers with a high degree of protection which is of vital importance, particularly in view of the importance of milk to growing boys and girls.

It is a standard of long standing in the State of Wisconsin. It is a standard that guarantees the basic purity and quality of the product produced, and let me add parenthetically that you must not delude yourselves with the fiction that the purity or quality of the product produced in any one of your States is superior to that produced in the greatest dairy State in this Union. It was and is essential to the maintenance of our preeminent position that we establish and maintain and improve every phase of agriculture required to meet the most rigorous standards established anywhere, that policy is vital to competitive agriculture. We have no intention in Wisconsin of being a residual supplier only, and we willingly accept the challenge to meet any standard of purity or quality and compete against anyone for the most efficient production.

I, too, believe in States rights and local responsibility, but I would not stultify the importance of those terms by using them as

a shield to protect the uneconomic entrepreneur.

So much for the past and the present. Let us move to the future for dairying in America. In many ways it is a bright future, even though beset with problems. New science and technology is coming into play each day. Our universities and experiment stations are finding better ways to produce, market and use nature's most perfect food. The development of whole milk powder and canned sterile whole milk is just in its infancy. Perhaps in this new technology lies the answer to some of our problems if—and I stress this is a big "if"—new and more ingenious restrictive devices aren't adopted to affect the new technology.

These restrictive devices aren't the wave of the future—they are the wave of the past. As illustrated by the present economic developments in Europe, the wave of the future is for expanded trade. The nations in the Inner Six of the European Economic Community are now forming a customs union to break down ancient trade barriers between their nations. Like the Articles of Confederation in our Nation's early history, the Common Market is seeking to allow the free interchange of goods and commodities between its members, thus allowing the most efficient producers in that area to produce free of restrictions. The development of the European Common Market is of vital significance to our Nation. We have a huge stake in the prosperity and strength of Europe. If we are to be in a competitive position with the Common Market, we, too, must reject the same type of restrictive devices that protect Italian Flats from German Volkswagens and Texas milk from Wisconsin milk.

In conclusion, let me say this: Realistic sanitation legislation is an absolute must for the economic survival of the most efficient dairy farmer. It need not be Federal legislation if all or most States adopt fair and reasonable provisions and do not exercise their local police power to unduly burden and obstruct milk marketing under the guise of acting to promote public health standards. We in Wisconsin would like the opportunity to provide the metropolitan consumer with a high standard product. We are blessed with the weather, the topography and the skills of generations of efficient dairy families. We merely wish to compete fairly and economically with other areas blessed with geographic proximity to urban markets.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me before the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee at the beginning of their hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 155, known as the quality stabilization bill. This is a companion bill to H.R. 10335 filed by me and identical bills filed by five other Members of the House of Representatives.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. Chairman and members of the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am grateful to the chairman

and members of this committee for your decision to hold hearings this week on the quality stabilization bill, Senate Joint Resolution 159. Your cooperation demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing a great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product, as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the loss-leader operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and blind merchandise.

OPERATION

If the owner of the trademark elects to come under quality stabilization, the retailers and distributors must cooperate with the owner or manufacturer in maintaining the stabilized price of that trademarked product. This enables the manufacturer to continue to build quality into his stabilized brand-name product. If the retailer violates the provisions of the quality stabilization law, the brand-name owner can revoke the retailer's right to use the brand name. If the distributor violates the revocation order, the brand-name owner (the manufacturer) can then institute a Federal civil suit for damages.

This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce the quality stabilization law. The law is 100 percent optional and the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, or consumer can choose to come under or stay out of quality stabilization. It provides a wholly meritorious and worthwhile opportunity for quality products to be distributed through quality-conserving resellers.

NOT FAIR TRADE

Since its introduction last January 1961, the merits of this proposed legislation have come to the attention of thousands upon thousands of manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and consumers. This bill is not fair trade legislation and is not a price-fixing measure.

The quality stabilization bill has now become one of the most widely publicized and acclaimed measures that await action in this session of Congress. In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases must be given consideration by this Congress. The marketplace is rapidly becoming infested with the so-called fast buck merchandisers.

OPTIONAL

In giving the manufacturer the optional right to control his trademark, safeguards are also established for the distributor, the retailer and, most important of all, the consumer. It is imperative in considering the bill, that you fully realize that its use by the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer is optional. No product can be stabilized under the proposed quality stabilization law unless competitive products are available to the consumer. And sale or purchase of a product stabilized under the proposed law is also completely voluntary on the part of the

distributor, the retailer, and the consumer. It is of fundamental importance that this bill be recognized as one not aimed at harming any legitimate business, but as a measure of economic benefit to all.

BUSINESS FAILURES

The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures (bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival) climbed in 1960 to the highest point since 1933 and the great depression. The House Small Business Committee, in its December 16, 1960, report entitled "Status of Small Business (1948-1958)," 86th Congress, 2d session, made this frightening statement:

"Most small retailers discontinue businesses without going through bankruptcy. This explains why, of the 139,000 who discontinued business in 1959, only 6,873 showed up among the business failures."

There are about 2 million retailers in America; 88 percent of them operate in only one location from one store; 70 percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under \$100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States: 91 percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses; 71 percent operate from only one building.

It is the well-known brand names—brands with a reputation for reliability—that are taking it on the chin. If these brands did not have such an excellent reputation, do you suppose they would be of interest even for one minute to the discount store who needs a traffic builder for his kind of selling?

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand-name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

Quality stabilization covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control—that is, prevent—the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are:

1. Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.
2. Bait and switch merchandising tactics.
3. Price.

To repeat, it is not compulsory that the brand-name owner use the law.

MECHANICS OF USING THE LAW

The manufacturer who does elect to use the quality stabilization law will publish a specific retail price at which his trademarked product must be sold. He has this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the good will of his brand name, the ethical reseller and the consumer. This is not to say that the manufacturer cannot change his specific price. Not at all. Competition is promoted—not restricted—by the quality stabilization bill, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of his business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill—price deviation, bait and switch tactics, misrepresentation, then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. The bill states that lack of due diligence in revoking the rights

of competing resellers known to the trademark owner to be committing similar acts of unfair competition will constitute a valid defense against any action brought under this law.

With the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED BY SUPREME COURT

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts; as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade.

The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark.

The quality stabilization bill simply provides that when a trademark is abused, the trademark owner may deny that unfair reseller further use of the brand name or trademark. Essentially, it is a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co. v. Seagram-Distiller's Corp.* (299 U.S. 183 (1936)), that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the good will symbolized by his trademark. The bill describes how the manufacturer may protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The quality stabilization bill leaves the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who abuse the quality stabilization bill to effect illegal collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting the same prosecution as the heavy electrical firms and their executives experienced not long ago in Philadelphia.

To underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age or other details of the quality-stabilized brand, by bait and switch merchandising techniques or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's specific price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated \$9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does

not take long until that honored product loses customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to temporarily pack his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

We need protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents a product or spends his adult life and great sums of money to establish a brand name or trademark.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence—confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: quality and price, or, price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

I feel confident that there will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then, only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to come under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate. I predict that enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in a drastic drop in the number of small business failures.

Obviously, the buying public will benefit from this bill. For the first time in a number of years, the consumer will have a standard against which to measure quality. The quality stabilization law will also give protection to the consumer against entrapment and unwise purchase of the loss-leader merchant specializing in bait-and-switch tactics.

HELP RESTORE EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need, instead, economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years purchasers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Smaller manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit the high pressure, falsely advertising retailers, as a means of staying in business. This type of retailer

may be few in number but they are powerful and heavily financed, and growing in size and number every day.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will give manufacturers the confidence to build better products instead of cheaper products with poor quality.

This bill will give the bargain seeker an opportunity of knowing what is a bargain by placing a standard of value as a gage.

NONPARTISAN

This is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Ten U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored quality stabilization, and seven Members—from both parties—have introduced the bills in the House of Representatives.

I am hereby submitting with my statement the list of more than 50 national trade and professional organizations that have endorsed this quality stabilization bill:

Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.
National Retail Hardware Association.
National Retail Furniture Association.
National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers.

National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association.

National Sporting Goods Association.
National Office Machine Dealers Association.

Retail Jewelers of America.
Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association.

Independent Garage Owners of America.
Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.

Wholesale Stationers' Association.
National Stationery & Office Equipment Association.

National Wholesale Jewelers Association.
American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association.

Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association.

National Association of House to House Installment Companies, Inc.

Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.

Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America.

Sporting Goods Jobbers Association.
Billiard & Bowling Institute of America.

American Watch Association, Inc.
Automotive Service Industry Association.

Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

National Wholesale Hardware Association.
Watch Material Distributors of America.

National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.

The National Association of Shirt, Pajama & Sportswear Manufacturers.

National Industrial Distributors Association.

Christian Booksellers Association.
National Small Business Men's Association.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.
National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.
American Research Merchandising Institute.

American Retailers Association.
National Art Materials Trade Association.

Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association.

National Shoe Retailers Association.
Northamerican Heating & Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.

American Watch Manufacturers Association.

National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.
National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.

National Office Furniture Association, Inc.
National Outerwear & Sportswear Association.

The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.

National Frozen Food Association, Inc.
American Association of Small Business.
National Association of Glove Manufacturers.

National Association of Retail Druggists.
Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.

National Marine Products Association.
Retail Tobacco Dealers of America.

National Association of Tobacco Distributors.

National Retail Farm Equipment Association.

Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries.

American Pharmaceutical Association.

I thank you.

Chemical Progress Week, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House that April 9-13, 1962, is being observed nationally as Chemical Progress Week.

It is the ninth annual observance. This year's theme, "New Worlds Through Chemistry," is more than just a slogan to the men and women of the chemical industry. It implies the industry's vital role in America's race to the stars, and it applies to exciting advancements in other chemical products—from synthetic fibers to miracle drugs.

PROGRESS THROUGH RESEARCH

Chemical Progress Week spotlights the continual advancements made by the chemical industry to contribute to healthier, more comfortable, safer lives for every American.

Each year more than 500 new industrial chemicals are developed in the laboratories and research departments of more than 12,000 producers in the industry. Chemical companies on an industrywide basis spend more of their own money on research—outside Government grants and private endowments—than any other U.S. industry. In 1961, the chemical industry allotted approximately \$800 million for basic and product research.

For every 10,000 persons employed in production facilities in the chemical industry, there are 623 working in research—the highest proportion of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

PROGRESS THROUGH GROWTH AND DIVERSIFICATION

Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., the national trade association of the industry, reports that the chemical industry is fourth in size in terms of assets—\$26 billion—among U.S. industries; fifth, in terms of sales—nearly \$30 billion last year.

But, despite the size of the industry, the combined sales of the three largest companies account for only 17 percent

of total industry sales. And nearly 65 percent of the industry's plants employ less than 20 people each. In all, some 830,000 men and women are employed in America's chemical industry.

Nor is the industry content to stand still. Last year, according to U.S. Government figures, the chemical industry spent more than \$1½ billion on new plants and equipment.

In my State of West Virginia, there are 41 establishments employing 40,577 people; with an annual payroll of \$256,738,000. West Virginia ranks 12th in the chemical manufacturing industry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Micah 7: 7: *Therefore I will look unto the Lord; my God will hear me.*

O Thou who canst lift us out of weakness into power and out of weariness into peace, may we daily be blessed with the faith that will make us faithful.

Grant that we may seek diligently and covet earnestly Thy divine wisdom and strength for the duties and responsibilities of our high calling.

Inspire us with devotion and dedication to that which is noble and true in order that we may have within our hearts the throb and thrill of Thy joy which the world cannot give or take away.

Endow us with that magnanimous and sacrificial spirit of our Saviour who never spared Himself in the great mission of giving to needy humanity the morning wonder and glory of a new day.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) entitled "An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CENSURE OF ISRAEL

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Security Council of the United Nations has voted to censure Israel for its part in last month's Lake Tiberius incident on the basis of a U.S. introduced and actively supported resolution.

This resolution was introduced despite clear evidence that Syrian guns had fired first upon Israel shipping in clearly recognized Israel waters and that the shoot-

ing was repeated despite Israel's complaints to U.N. truce supervisors.

The U.S. delegation to the U.N. pressed vigorously for a one-sided vote of censure in the face of disputed testimony by Maj. Gen. Carl C. Von Horn, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, regarding the presence of Syrian fortifications along the Israel-Syrian frontier.

Israel has presented facts to indicate a heavy buildup of Soviet-made weapons by Syrian forces along the frontier area which gives rise to a question of alternate Syrian intentions against Israel.

The unilateral condemnation of Israel leaves unpunished Syria's hostile actions, and could serve as an open invitation to Syria to resume its harassment of Israel shipping. It can only lead to a further aggravation of an already tense situation.

The United States has repeatedly and firmly expressed its support and deep commitment to an effective peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I am today introducing a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to the motivation, and underlying reasons, for the sponsorship by this country and support before the Security Council of the U.N. of the censure of Israel which occurred on April 9, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Anderson, Ill.	Cahill	Dingell
Andrews	Casey	Dooley
Anfuso	Celler	Dowdy
Barrett	Chelf	Dwyer
Battin	Church	Fascell
Blitch	Coad	Finnegan
Boykin	Collier	Flynt
Breeding	Curtis, Mass.	Fulton
Brewster	Dawson	Gavin
Buckley	Derwinski	Grant

Harrison, Va.	Macdonald	Rousselot
Harvey, Mich.	Michel	St. Germain
Healey	Miller	Schwengel
Hébert	George P.	Scott
Hoffman, Ill.	Moulder	Selden
Hoffman, Mich.	Murphy	Shelley
Hollifield	Nedzi	Smith, Miss.
Huddleston	Nix	Spence
Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.	Steed
Jennings	Patman	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Ala.	Powell	Van Pelt
Kee	Pucinski	Walter
Kelly	Rains	Whitten
Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson, Ind.
Kluczynski	Roberts, Ala.	Yates
Lankford	Roosevelt	Zelenko
L'bonati	Rostenkowski	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-seven members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 589 calls up for consideration H.R. 10788, a bill which amends section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This bill comes before the House under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act authorizes the President to negotiate agreements with foreign governments providing for limitation of imports of any agricultural commodity or products, including textiles or textile products. Section 204 also authorizes the President to issue regulations implementing those import agreements.

But before discussing the details of the amendment to this section, let me sketch briefly the background of the problem with which the bill deals; namely, the rise in cotton textile imports.